

Cornell University Library
Ithaca, New York

BOUGHT WITH THE INCOME OF THE
SAGE ENDOWMENT FUND

THE GIFT OF
HENRY W. SAGE

1891


Cornell University Library
D 363.S45 1899

Political history of Europe, since 1814.



3 1924 027 804 537

o11n



Cornell University Library

The original of this book is in
the Cornell University Library.

There are no known copyright restrictions in
the United States on the use of the text.

A POLITICAL
HISTORY OF EUROPE
SINCE 1814

BY
CHARLES SEIGNOBOS
OF THE UNIVERSITY OF PARIS

TRANSLATION EDITED BY
S. M. MACVANE
Professor of History in Harvard University



NEW YORK
HENRY HOLT AND COMPANY
1907

Copyright, 1899,
BY
HENRY HOLT & CO.

EDITOR'S PREFACE.

The *Histoire Politique de l'Europe Contemporaine* by Professor Seignobos seems to me to merit larger use among people of English speech than it is likely to receive in the original French. The author's capacity for seizing on the decisive events of recent European history, his skill in using one event to explain another, his steady interest in the welfare of the common mass of men, his thorough freedom from national or other prejudice, and above all his very suggestive generalizations on the later history of Europe, give his work instructive qualities not always found in our general histories.

In a few points this is not a simple translation. Here and there a phrase or even a whole passage has been omitted—sometimes because the matter seemed of little importance to students in this country, sometimes because it would not have been intelligible to ordinary readers without explanatory notes for which space could not easily be afforded. In the chapters on England I have taken somewhat larger liberties. In his treatment of recent English history Professor Seignobos seems to me to have been less successful than in the rest of his work. In trying to remedy imperfections I have not thought it expedient to distract the reader's attention with marks indicating my departures from the original. Whatever of apology is due to the author for this course is freely offered.

A full index has been added. Various new titles have been inserted in the bibliographies, chiefly of books in English. I had wished to add a general bibliography for the whole period, but time could not be found for the preparation of it.

While assuming full responsibility for the contents of this volume, justice to a most efficient coadjutor requires me to say that most of the actual labour of translation has been done by another.

S. M. MACVANE.

HARVARD UNIVERSITY, September, 1899.

PREFACE.

IN publishing a contemporary history of Europe in a single volume, I feel obliged to justify an enterprise so palpably rash.

I shall not stop to point out the advantage of presenting in a sketch the history necessary to a better understanding of the world in which we live. The question is, not whether this history be worth reading, but whether it can be written. I shall, therefore, frankly set forth the difficulties of the task, the solutions or expedients which I have adopted, and the sacrifices which I have been obliged to make. I hope thus to show why this bold attempt has seemed to me practicable, on condition that I yield to practical necessities; also to show how these necessities have controlled the object, the method, and the plan of this work.

The greatest obstacle to the writing of the history of the nineteenth century is the overwhelming supply of materials. The rigorous historical method demands the direct study of the sources. Now the life of one man would not be long enough—I do not say to study or to criticise—but *to read* the official documents of even a single country of Europe. It is therefore, in the nature of things, impossible to write a contemporary history of Europe that shall conform to scientific principles. So the professional historians, judging their method to be inapplicable to the study of the nineteenth century, have abstained from dealing with this period. And so the reading public is ignorant of contemporary history because the learned have too copious means of learning it.

It has seemed to me possible to relax the rigour of critical method, and to substitute for direct study of the documents a procedure, less perfect logically, but more practicable and at the same time sufficient for attaining a part at least of true history. All the facts of the political history of our own times have been set forth in monographs, special histories, and annual publications, all made at first hand. The extracts and analyses given in these works suffice to exhibit the facts with sufficient clearness to enable us to dispense ordinarily with a study of the original docu-

ment. The exactness and authenticity of contemporary documents lessen greatly the need of criticism. Finally the similarity of the works written in different countries on the same questions, renders control easy—on condition of bringing to the choice and study of these works the severe criticism that one would apply to the sources.

The second difficulty for the historian is the impossibility of citing his evidences. It is a very essential rule of the historical method that every statement be supported by reference to the sources on which it rests. Now in contemporary history the number of documents is such that the regular method of citation has to be abandoned. But this sacrifice too is excusable. The general facts emerge from the reading of the documents with so great clearness and certainty, that it is sufficient to indicate the works in which the proofs are given. I have therefore thought myself justified in omitting references at the foot of each page and in confining myself to a critical bibliography at the end of the chapters.

In the bibliography also I have had to adopt a practical device instead of the regular method. A bibliography of contemporary history, made according to the rules of erudition, would fill a volume. I have had to confine myself to what is indispensable. My rule has been to name only those bibliographies and general histories which serve as guides to the detailed works, the great collections of documents and the most trustworthy and convenient monographs on every question, so that the reader might test my statements by recurring to the works on which I have relied.

This summary method of reading and citation compelled me to restrict my narrative to the general facts of political life, known to all concerned and admitted without dispute. But it is just these undisputed facts which constitute the matter of political history. So I have not tried to establish any disputed fact, nor to discover any unknown one. It is by bringing together the general facts already known, but remaining scattered, that new conclusions have, as I think, been reached.

By confining myself to setting forth results that nobody would dream of disputing, I have had to deny myself all erudite research and all discussion of particular facts subject to controversy, for I should have had to advance statements whereof I could not find space to give the proofs. I have had, then, to renounce not only all argument and discussion of other works, but also all attempts

at full narrative, all descriptions, character-sketches, and anecdotes—such things being nearly always matters of dispute. From this rule I have departed only in the case of certain transactions which had great consequences. Even in these cases I have told only the decisive episodes, as to which there is no conflict of testimony in the authorities.

Having thus cut myself off from all chance for literary display and the use of learned apparatus, I have avoided the two kinds of histories to which the historians have accustomed the public—the narrative history and the erudite history. My aim has been to enable my readers to comprehend the essential phenomena of the political life of Europe in the nineteenth century by explaining the organization of the nations, governments, and parties, the political questions which have arisen in the course of the century, and the solutions they have received. I have tried to write an *explanatory* history.

The date for beginning fixes itself readily; it is the year 1814—the year of the general restoration of the old governments of Europe. As to the date for closing, I have purposely avoided the adoption of any, in order to reserve the right of following the development of political life into the most recent events.

The task in hand, then, is to explain the political transformations of contemporary Europe during this period of eighty years. Being unable to deal with the whole movement of European civilization within the period, I have purposely confined myself to the political history. I have avoided all social phenomena that have had no direct effect on political life: art, science, literature, religion, private manners, and customs. I have sought chiefly to make clear the formation, composition, tactics, and policies of the parties, as being the capital facts determining the fate of institutions. But I have not thought it possible to limit political history to an account of strictly political events and institutions. Aiming above all to *explain* the phenomena by showing how they are connected with each other, I have reserved room for some non-political facts: local administration, the army, the church, the schools, the press, political theories, economic systems—in all cases in which they have reacted on political life.

Having settled the choice of facts, it remained to classify them. Here comes another difficulty of contemporary history. There are three possible orders of proceeding: 1st, the *logical* order, which consists in analyzing the political organization of European states, studying it as a whole in all the states, taking suc-

cessively each of the institutions (central government, army, finances, justice, etc.); 2d, the *chronological* order which consists in dividing the whole into periods, treating each period in succession; 3d, the *geographical* order, which takes up one country at a time and finishes its history before passing to another.

The logical order is best for bringing out the features common to all the nations and the features peculiar to each. The chronological order is most convenient for presenting transactions common to several countries and the reciprocal action of state on state. The geographical order gives opportunity to explain more clearly the political organization and special evolution of each people; for in contemporary Europe each country coincides with a society subject to the same political system and worked upon by the same causes.

Thus each of the three methods has advantages for treating one of the aspects of contemporary evolution: if I adopted one of them, to the exclusion of the others, I should run a risk of falling into confusion in parts of my undertaking. I have therefore used all three methods successively, grouping the facts of contemporary history in three successive parts.

The first part is taken up with the domestic political history of the European states; in this I follow the geographical order. After a summary description of Europe in 1814, as fashioned by the territorial restorations of the Congress of Vienna, I study separately and successively the internal history of each state. I have arranged the countries roughly in the order of seniority in the development of public life. At the head I have placed England, which furnished the model of political organization for all Europe; then France and her most advanced neighbours, the Netherlands and Switzerland; then the Iberian countries; following these the states of central Europe, Italy, Germany, and Austria, and the Scandinavian countries; finally the group of eastern states, Ottoman and Russian, which have longest retained the political forms of the eighteenth century. This part takes the natural form of a series of national histories, placed side by side but wholly independent of each other.

In the second part, constructed according to the logical order, I have grouped certain political phenomena common to various European communities; I have considered them apart from the evolution of each people in order to bring out their universal character. The matters treated in this part are the changes in the material conditions of political life and the action of parties

that are not limited by national boundaries—the Catholics and the revolutionary Socialists.

The third part is given up to the external relations between the states. Here the facts are presented by periods, following the chronological order. Each period is marked by the preponderance of one of the great powers—Austria, England, Russia, France, Germany. The aim has been, not to relate the diplomatic and military achievements the details of which are already familiar, but to note for each period the chief features of the foreign policy of the principal governments, and to explain the changes in the relations between states and in the distribution of territory and influence.

The question of style has been for me a matter of some concern. The work being intended as a scientific manual, its language needed to be brief, clear, and exact. Practical necessity compelled me to aim above all at brevity,—sometimes, I fear, to the point of obscurity,—but I have never sacrificed clearness to elegance. Whenever a word already used appeared to me to make the phrase clearer, I have never hesitated to repeat it. As between two terms I have always chosen the most familiar as being the easiest to understand; I have avoided metaphors which dazzle without enlightening. Much time has been spent in seeking the expression that seemed likely to call for least effort on the part of the reader.

Precision has been harder to attain. History is still so rudimentary a science—if a science it may be called—that it has no vocabulary of technical terms. To designate political phenomena, the historians have borrowed from the vocabulary of jurists and philosophers abstract terms which have now become part of the language of history. These terms have but vague notions to rest on, owing to our ignorance of the real nature of political phenomena; but they give the vagueness an appearance of technical precision. It has seemed to me more straightforward to give the popular name to popular notions. So I have avoided abstract nouns—such as royalty, the Church, elements, tendencies—which so easily come to seem mystic forces. When I have had to describe the acts or ideas of groups of men, I have always designated the group either by its national, party, or class name, or by a collective noun,—such as government, ministry, clergy,—so that the reader may be able to discover, behind this name, the men who have acted or thought.

As regards impartiality in political and national questions, I

shall not do my readers and myself the wrong of claiming as a merit that which is the duty of every historian. Having adopted the tone of a scientific treatise, I have had no occasion for display of personal feelings toward any party or nation. I have indeed a preference for a liberal, unclerical, democratic, Western government; but I have a conscience too, and it has saved me, as I think, from the temptation to distort or ignore phenomena that are personally distasteful to me. If I am deceived in this, the reader is aware of the direction in which it is possible that I have had a leaning.

It may perhaps be thought that I have given too large space to the short periods of revolution, to the detriment of the long periods of conservation. The justification is that I have tried to write an *explanatory history of political evolution*. Now, conservative repose being the normal condition of humanity, it has no need of explanation; and when a system goes on without change, it is enough to describe it once for all. Revolution being exceptional, it cannot be understood without a somewhat full account of the exceptional circumstances that gave rise to it; and since it changes the organization of society, it makes a new description necessary.

There is no general bibliography of European history. The student must look for the bibliographical notices in the universal bibliographies, the national bibliographies, and the collections of the bibliographies of periods, a list of which is given in chap. v., Langlois, "Manuel de Bibliographie Historique," 1896.

The leading collection of the documents common to all Europe is the "Staatsarchiv," published from time to time since 1861. According to its own sub-title "Collection of official acts for contemporary history," it contains official documents, especially for diplomacy.*

The account of political events in Europe is given each year in the form of annual publications, which also contain official documents. The chief of these are:

In English, the "Annual Register," which has appeared since the eighteenth century.

In French, the "Annuaire Historique Universel," from 1818 to 1861; "Annuaire des Deux-Mondes," from 1850 to 1870; "L'Année Politique," since 1874.

* The "Staatsarchiv" had been preceded by similar collections: "Archives Diplomatiques," 1821; "Neueste Staatsakten," 1825. These do not, however, form a continued series.

In German, Schulthess, "Europaeischer Geschichtskalender," since 1860, the most complete of all.

On the general contemporary history of Europe there are no scientific works except in German. These are of two classes, general histories and collections of special histories.

The general histories are: Gervinus, "Geschichte des XIX^{ten} Jahrhunderts," 8 vols., 1855-56, a famous literary work in its day but unreliable, stops before 1830 (translated into French, under the title "Hist. du XIX^e Siècle"). C. Bulle, "Geschichte der Neuesten Zeit" (the 1886 edition in four volumes goes as far as 1885), the most exact of the contemporary histories, but without references to authorities and without bibliographies and devoted chiefly to external history. Stern, "Geschichte Europas," vol. i., 1894, promises to be the most scientific history, but the first volume, the only one issued so far, stops at 1820.

There are two collections of contemporary histories. The "Staatengeschichte der Neuesten Zeit" is a series of histories of the different countries in several large volumes (I shall mention each in the special bibliography of each country); this is the most important collection for domestic history.

The Oncken collection of universal history, "Allgemeine Geschichte in Einzeldarstellungen," contains a special series of modern histories since 1789, composed of histories of special periods or events (Revolution, Restoration, Second Empire, Eastern Question, Reign of William I.); it gives special attention to international affairs. In French the modern histories are nothing but school-books.* The Alcan collection, "Bibliothèque d'Histoire Contemporaine," includes several histories of separate countries, most of them general sketches for popular use; they do not form a complete collection.

For political institutions the great Marquardsen collection, "Handbuch des Oeffentlichen Rechts der Gegenwart," since 1883 is a series of monographs on the constitutional law of each of the European states (unfortunately rather juridical than historical). These will be mentioned in the bibliography of each country.

For economic history the "Handwörterbuch der Staatswissenschaften" (six volumes and a supplement, vol. vii, 1890-95) gives, in dictionary form, monographs and detailed bibliographies.

* I have thought it unnecessary to mention the German school-books, such as Jaeger.

CONTENTS.

PART I.

CHAPTER I.

EUROPE IN 1814.

	PAGE
Fall of Napoleon.—The Congress of Vienna.—Territorial Settlements.—Europe after the Settlements of 1815.....	I

CHAPTER II.

ENGLAND.

ENGLAND BEFORE THE REFORM OF 1832.

The Central Government.—Local Government.—The Electoral System.—The Church.—Social Conditions.—The Condition of Ireland.—The Reform Movement.—Radical Agitation and Repressive Laws (1816-19).—Partial Reforms (1820-27).—Catholic Emancipation.—The Electoral Reform of 1832.....	10
--	----

CHAPTER III.

ENGLAND BETWEEN THE TWO REFORMS (1832-67).

New Conditions of Political Life.—Administrative Reforms (1833-40).—The Labour Agitation of the Trade Unions (1832-34).—The Chartist Agitation (1837-48).—The Irish Agitation.—The Free-Trade Agitation.—Industrial Legislation.—The Irish Crisis (1845-48).—Period of Inaction and Democratic Evolution (1849-65).—The Electoral Reform of 1867.....	40
---	----

CHAPTER IV.

ENGLAND AS A DEMOCRACY.

Conditions of Political Life.—Gladstone's Reforms (1868-74).—Trade-union Legislation.—The Imperialist Policy of the Conservative Ministry (1874-80).—Formation of the Irish Home Rule Party.—Struggle between the Liberal Ministry and the Irish Party (1880-85).—	xiii
--	------

Electoral Reform (1884-85).—Disruption of the Liberal Party (1885-86).—The Government of the Unionist Coalition (1886-92).—Salisbury's Irish Policy.—General Legislation of the Unionist Coalition (1886-92).—Formation of the Socialist Parties (1884-92).—The Fourth Gladstone Ministry (1892-94).—The Unionists Return to Power (1895).—Political Evolution of England in the Nineteenth Century.....	68
--	----

CHAPTER V.

FRANCE.

THE MONARCHY OF THE PROPERTY CLASS.

The Bourbon Restoration.—Political Institutions under the Charter.—Conditions of Political Life.—The Hundred Days and the Second Restoration.—Results of the Hundred Days.—The Counter-Revolutionary Crisis (1815-16).—Government of the Constitutional Party (1816-20).—Government of the Right (1820-27).—Conflict between the King and the Chamber (1827-30).—Revolution of 1830.—The Political System of Louis Philippe.—Party Struggle in the Government (1830-31).—Struggle against Insurrections (1831-34).—Suppression of the Republican Party (1834-35).—Formation of the Communist-Socialist Party.—Parliamentary Struggles (1836-40).—The Guizot Ministry (1840-48).—The Catholic and Democratic Opposition Parties.—Work of the Monarchy of the Property Classes.....	103
---	-----

CHAPTER VI.

THE REPUBLIC AND THE DEMOCRATIC EMPIRE.

The Revolution of 1848.—Struggles in the Provisional Government.—The Government of the Constituent Assembly.—The Government of the Monarchical Parties (1849-51).—The Conflict between the President and the Assembly.—Establishment of a Personal Power (1851-52).—The Autocratic Empire (1852-60).—Decline of the Autocratic Régime (1860-66).—The Liberal Concessions (1867-69).—The Liberal Empire and the Radical Party (1869-70).....	155
---	-----

CHAPTER VII.

THE PARLIAMENTARY REPUBLIC.

Government of the National Defence.—Election of the Assembly and the Commune.—Government of Thiers (1871-73).—The Government of the Monarchical Parties (1873-75).—The Constitution of 1875.—Struggle between the President and the Chamber (1876-79).—Supremacy and Changes of the Republican Party (1879-84).—Division of the	
---	--

Republican Party and Reconstitution of the Conservative Party (1884-87).—The Boulanger Crisis (1887-89).—The Transformation of the Extreme Parties.—New Division of Parties.—Political Evolution of France in the Nineteenth Century.....	187
---	-----

CHAPTER VIII.

BELGIUM AND HOLLAND.

Formation of the Kingdom of the Netherlands.—Belgian Opposition.—Revolution of 1830.—Founding of the Kingdom of Belgium....	229
---	-----

THE KINGDOM OF THE NETHERLANDS SINCE 1830.

The Constitution of 1848.—The Parties since 1848.—Luxemburg...	238
--	-----

THE KINGDOM OF BELGIUM.

Formation of Parties.—Struggles between Catholics and Liberals.—The School Law.—Establishment of Universal Suffrage.....	244
--	-----

CHAPTER IX.

SWITZERLAND.

The Switzerland of 1814.—Period of the Restoration (1814-30).—The Regeneration (1829-37).—Local Conflicts (1837-45).—The Sonderbund and the Civil War (1845-47).—The Federal Constitution of 1848.—Establishment of Direct Popular Legislation.—Initiative and Referendum in Changing the Constitution.—Initiative and Referendum in Ordinary Legislation.—Federal Constitutional Changes.—Transformations of the Political Parties since 1848.....	257
---	-----

CHAPTER X.

SPAIN AND PORTUGAL.

SPAIN.

Spain at the end of the Napoleonic Wars.—Restoration of 1814.—Revolution of 1820.—Restoration of 1823.—War of the Succession (1830-33).—The Statute of 1834 and the Constitution of 1837.—The Carlist War (1834-39).—The Military Dictatorship of Espartero and of Narvaez (1840-51).—The Concordat of 1851 and the Breaking up of Parties.—The Liberal Union and the Revolution of 1854.—The Revolution of 1868.—The Constitution of 1869.—The Republic (1873-74).—The Restoration of 1874.—The Constitutional Monarchy.....	286
---	-----

PORTUGAL.

The Constitution of 1826.—Struggles between Chartists and Septemberists (1834-52).—The Regenerators and the Deficit.....	319
--	-----

CHAPTER XI.

ITALY.

PAGE

The Restoration in Italy.—The Military Revolutions of 1820 and 1821.—The Revolution of 1831.—Mazzini and the Republican Party.—The "Risorgimento."—The Revolutions of 1848.—Internal Discords.—The Reaction.—The Constitutional Kingdom of Sardinia (1849-58).—Cavour's Policy.—Formation of the Kingdom of Italy (1859-60).—The Roman Question (1860-66).—Annexation of Venetia and Rome (1866-70).—Formation of Parties and Internal Difficulties (1861-70).—The Consorteria (1861-76).—Accession of the Left (1876).—The Triple Alliance and Personal Rivalries.—Crispi's Government (1887-96). 326

CHAPTER XII.

GERMANY.

GERMANY BEFORE THE UNION.

Germany in 1814.—Formation of the Germanic Confederation (1815).—The Individual Governments and Constitutions.—Parties in Germany.—University Persecution.—The Opposition of the Constitutional States of the South.—Movements of 1830.—The National Movement since 1840.—The Revolution of 1848 in Germany.—The Frankfurt Parliament.—The Prussian Union.—German Reaction. 374

CHAPTER XIII.

THE AUSTRIAN EMPIRE UNDER THE ABSOLUTIST SYSTEM.

The Austrian Empire in 1814.—Metternich's System.—National Opposition in Hungary.—National Opposition by the Slavs.—Liberal German Opposition.—The Revolution of 1848.—The Revolution in Hungary.—The Revolution in the Slav Countries.—The Civil War and the Repression.—The Hungarian War.—The Absolutist Restoration of 1849.—The Concordat of 1855 401

CHAPTER XIV.

THE KINGDOM OF PRUSSIA BEFORE WILLIAM I.

Prussian Reforms during the Wars of Napoleon.—Political Life in Prussia.—The Absolutist Reforms (1814-23).—Creation of the Provincial Estates (1815-25).—End of Frederick William III.'s Reign.—Opening Years of Frederick William IV.'s Reign (1840-47).—The United Landtag of 1847.—Revolution of 1848.—The National Assembly.—The Constitution of 1850.—The Reaction (1850-59).—Prussia's German Policy.—The Zollverein 424

CHAPTER XV.

ESTABLISHMENT OF GERMAN UNITY.

	PAGE
Reform of the Prussian Army (1859-62).—Formation of the Progress Party (1861-62).—The Conflict Regarding the Constitution (1862-66).—The National-Liberal Agitation in Germany (1859-64).—Crisis of the Duchies (1864-66).—Dissolution of the Confederation (1866).—Annexations by Prussia.—Formation of the North German Confederation (1866-67).—Transformation of the Parties (1866-70).—Southern Germany.—Foundation of the Empire (1870-71).....	456

CHAPTER XVI.

THE GERMAN EMPIRE.

Parties in the Empire.—Conditions of Political Life.—The Kulturkampf and the Organization of the Empire (1871-77).—Struggle against the Socialists (1878).—Bismarck's Economic and Social Policy (1878-86).—The Army Law and the "Cartel" (1886-88).—William II. and Christian Socialism.—The "New Course."—Alsace-Lorraine.—Political Development of Germany in the Nineteenth Century.....	485
--	-----

CHAPTER XVII.

THE CONSTITUTIONAL SYSTEM IN AUSTRIA.

FORMATION OF AUSTRO-HUNGARY.

The Constitution of October 1860.—The Constitution of 1861.—Attempt at a Unitary Government (1861-65).—Suspension of the Constitution.—The Hungarian Compromise.—The Liberal Constitutions of 1867.....	518
---	-----

AUSTRIA-HUNGARY

Conditions of Political Life in Austria.—Political and National Parties.—The Liberal Ministry (1867-70).—Attempt at a Federalist Constitution (1870-71).—Electoral Reform and Constitutionalist Ministries (1871-78).—Parties and Politics in Hungary (1867-78).—Crisis of the Occupation of Bosnia (1878).—Federalist Policy of the Taaffe Ministry (1879-93).—German-Polish Coalition and Electoral Reform of 1896.—Political Struggles in Hungary since 1878.—Political Evolution of Austria-Hungary in the Nineteenth Century	529
---	-----

CHAPTER XVIII.

THE SCANDINAVIAN COUNTRIES.

	PAGE
Formation of the Scandinavian States	554

SWEDEN.

Transformation of the Swedish Constitution.—Swedish Parties....	556
---	-----

NORWAY.

The Democratic Party.—The Constitutional Conflict.—The National Conflict.....	559
---	-----

DENMARK AND THE DUCHIES.

The Danish Monarchy before the Separation of the Duchies.—The Duchies of Schleswig-Holstein.—The Wars of the Duchies.—The Cession of the Duchies.—The Constitution of 1866.—The Constitutional Conflict (1873-94).—Iceland.....	566
---	-----

CHAPTER XIX.

THE RUSSIAN EMPIRE AND POLAND.

The Russian Empire in 1814.—The Government of Alexander I.—Finland and the Constitutional Kingdom of Poland.—The Insurrection of December, 1825.—The Polish Insurrection (1830-32).—The Empire under Nicholas (1825-35).—Liberal Reaction against the "Nicholas System."—The Emancipation of the Serfs (1858-63).—Alexander II.'s Liberal Reforms.—The Polish Insurrection of 1863.—Repression of the Polish National Movement.—Return to Absolutism in Russia.—The Opposition Parties.—Alexander III.'s Reign.—Russification.—Tsar Nicholas II.....	578
--	-----

CHAPTER XX.

THE OTTOMAN EMPIRE.

The Ottoman Empire in 1814.—Crisis of the Greek Insurrection (1820-27).—Mahmoud's Reforms (1826-38).—Crisis of Egyptian Conflicts (1833-40).—The Reforms of Reschid Pasha (1838-50).—Period of the Crimean War (1852-59).—Attempts at Reform, Fuad and Ali (1859-71).—Financial Crisis and Young Turkey (1871-76).—Russian Invasion, Crisis and Dismemberment (1877-78).—Personal Government of Abdul-Hamid.....	616
--	-----

CHAPTER XXI.

THE CHRISTIAN NATIONS OF THE BALKANS.

	PAGE
Christian Nations of the Ottoman Empire in 1814	638

ROUMANIA.

The Principalities of Moldavia and Wallachia up to 1856.—Formation of the State of Roumania (1856-66).—The Constitutional Monarchy	640
--	-----

GREECE.

The Greek Nation before 1820.—Formation of the Kingdom of Greece (1820-29).—The Absolutist System (1829-43).—Greece under the Constitutional System.....	648
--	-----

SERVIA AND MONTENEGRO.

Formation of the Principality of Servia.—Servia under the Constitutional System.—Montenegro.....	657
--	-----

BULGARIA.

The Bulgarian People before the Union of 1885.—Bulgaria since the Union of 1885	664
---	-----

PART II.

CHAPTER XXII.

TRANSFORMATION IN THE MATERIAL CONDITIONS OF
POLITICAL LIFE.

Industrial Inventions.—New Means of Destruction.—New Methods of Communication.—Transformation in Population.—Increase in Wealth.—Transformation in Economic Life.....	671
---	-----

CHAPTER XXIII.

THE CHURCH AND THE CATHOLIC PARTIES.

The Church before the Revolution.—The Revolution in the Church.—The Restoration of the Church.—The Ultramontane Party.—The Liberal Catholic Party.—The Catholic Democracy and the Revolution of 1848.—Reaction in the Church.—The Encyclical "Quanta Cura" and the Syllabus (1864).—The Vatican Council (1869-70).—Conflicts between Church and State.—Policy of Leo XIII.	684
---	-----

CHAPTER XXIV.

THE INTERNATIONAL REVOLUTIONARY PARTIES.

	PAGE
Free Masons and Carbonari.—The Republican "Young Europe."—The Socialistic Schools.—The Communist Parties.—The Revolutionary Parties during the Revolution of 1848 and the Reaction.—The International (1862-72).—Formation of the Socialist Platform in Germany (1863-75).—The Anarchist Parties.—Formation of the National Socialist Parties.—Policy of the Revolutionary Parties.—The International Socialist Congresses.....	718

PART III.

CHAPTER XXV.

EUROPE UNDER THE METTERNICH SYSTEM (1815-30).

European Questions in 1815.—The Holy Alliance (1815).—Rivalry between Alexander I. and Metternich (1815-18).—Congress of Aix-la-Chapelle and Alexander's Conversion (1818).—Austrian Congresses ; the Interventions (1820-23).—English Policy under Canning.—Intervention in the East (1823-29).—Breaking up of the European Alliance (1830).....	747
---	-----

CHAPTER XXVI.

RIVALRY BETWEEN RUSSIA AND ENGLAND (1830-54).

Conditions of Foreign Policy after 1830.—Recognition of the July Monarchy (1830).—Settlement of Belgium (1830-32).—The Polish Question (1830-32).—Intervention of Austria and France in Italy (1831-32).—Intervention in Spain and Portugal (1833-36).—The Eastern Question (1832-33).—The Refugees and the Alliance of the Absolutist Monarchies (1833).—Rupture of the Alliance between France and England (1836-40).—The Eastern Question and the Straits Convention (1839-41).—The "State of Good Feeling" (1841-45).—The Spanish Marriages (1846).—The Cracow Affair (1846).—The Portuguese and Italian Affairs (1847).—The Swiss Affair (1847-48).—Revolutions of 1848.—The Restorations (1849).—Austria's Triumph over Prussia (1850).—Recognition of the French Empire (1852).—The Tsar and the Eastern Question (1852-53).....	764
---	-----

CHAPTER XXVII.

FRENCH PREPONDERANCE AND THE NATIONALIST WARS
(1854-70).

	PAGE
Transformations in European Policy.—The Crimean War (1853-56).	
—The Congress of Paris (1856).—Napoleon's Predominance (1856-59).	
—Alliance between France and Sardinia (1858).—The Italian War (1859).—Peace with Austria (1859).—Annexations and the Italian Question (1860-62).—The Polish Affairs (1863).—The War of the Duchies (1864).—Rupture between Prussia and Austria (1864-66).—The War of 1866.—Peace of Prague (1866).—The Luxemburg Affair (1867).—Latest Conflict between France and Prussia (1867-70).—Declaration of War (1870).....	787

CHAPTER XXVIII.

GERMAN ASCENDENCY AND THE ARMED PEACE.

War with France (1870-71).—Treaties of London and Frankfurt (1871).—New Conditions of European Policy since 1871.—The Alliance of the Three Emperors (1871-76).—Eastern Affairs (1875-76).—The Turkish War (1877-78).—Peace of San Stefano and Congress of Berlin (1878).—Formation of the Triple Alliance (1879-83).—Formation of the Franco-Russian Understanding.—Armed Peace.....	813
---	-----

CONCLUSION.

POLITICAL EVOLUTION OF EUROPE.....	834
INDEX.....	849

A POLITICAL HISTORY OF CONTEMPORARY EUROPE.

CHAPTER I.

EUROPE IN 1814.

Fall of Napoleon.—The contemporary history of Europe begins with a European event, the defeat of Napoleon I., who had attacked all the states, overturning their internal organization or transforming their external relations.

Directly or indirectly, every nation in Europe felt Napoleon's influence. He reigned directly over the French Empire, which comprised not only ancient France and the countries annexed by the Republic (Belgium and the Rhine Provinces), but pieces of Switzerland, one-third of Italy, the Netherlands, western Germany, and the Illyrian Provinces. On all these countries he imposed an absolute military government. He lorded it over the neighbouring states; the kingdoms of Spain, Naples, Italy, and Westphalia he gave to his relatives; on the German states, united in the Confederation of the Rhine, on Switzerland, and on Denmark he imposed treaties of offensive and defensive alliance. He had even, in 1812, compelled the two independent German monarchies, Austria and Prussia, to join him against Russia. In the end there remained outside of his power only the extremities of Europe: England, Russia, Sweden, Sicily, Portugal, and the Spanish insurgents. With all these he was at war. All Europe was thus divided into two camps: Napoleon and his enemies.

At the defeat of Napoleon, his whole territorial organization of Europe fell to pieces. In 1813 Prussia and Austria deserted him and joined his enemies. Thus was formed the union of the four great powers, officially called the Allies (England, Russia, Aus-

tria, and Prussia), which took the direction of the war, and attached to the coalition the German states and dispossessed sovereigns of Italy. The Allies concentrated their forces against Napoleon's army in Saxony; the battle of Leipzig gave them all Germany at one blow. They then offered Napoleon France with its territory of 1800 (Frankfort, November, 1813). Subsequently their three armies invaded France, and their next offer to Napoleon was the territory of 1790 (Châtillon, 1814). Finally they took Paris and decided to dethrone Napoleon (March, 1814).

All the territories annexed to France since 1790, and all the states organized by Napoleon, found themselves then without sovereigns. The Allies, now masters of Europe, assumed the right to dispose of them. Before quitting France they decided to hold at Vienna a general congress of "all the powers which had taken part in the war on either side," thus inviting all the states of Europe. But by a secret article the Allies reserved to themselves the right of settling the affairs of "the countries abandoned by France, and the arrangements necessary for establishing a permanent equilibrium," and they outlined a plan of territorial division. There remained for the congress only to register the decisions of the Allies.

The Congress of Vienna.—All the states of Europe had taken part in the war; all sent plenipotentiaries to Vienna. Ninety sovereign princes and fifty-three mediatised princes were represented. Such a large gathering of diplomats after so many years of war, and after the brilliant victory of the legitimate governments over revolutionary France, made an unusual stir in the city of Vienna; the Austrian government had established a committee on entertainments; there was a continuous round of receptions, parties, and balls.

Business was to be done in general meeting. The Allies had announced the congress to be held in June or July; later they summoned it for October 1; finally they fixed on November 1 as the date for the "formal opening of the congress." It was to begin with the submission and examination of credentials. As a matter of fact, the operation never took place, *the congress never was opened*. There was in truth no congress; there were only committees of plenipotentiaries who signed treaties between particular states. These treaties were eventually brought together in a single instrument called the final act of the Congress of Vienna (July 9, 1815).

The great powers settled the affairs of Europe and imposed

their will on the other states. The four Allies had agreed on the main points as early as May 30. The territories to be disposed of were the districts taken from France and from the various states created by Napoleon: Belgium, Holland, the left bank of the Rhine, Italy, Germany, and the Grand Duchy of Warsaw. On the 30th of May they settled the distribution of those about which there was no dispute: namely, Italy, Belgium, and the left bank of the Rhine. The rest, Germany and Poland, they left over to the Congress of Vienna. At Vienna, the plenipotentiaries of the four great powers decided to come to an agreement about the reserved questions first among themselves, but to extend to the ambassadors of France and Spain the compliment of an invitation to take part in the conferences. As the English envoy said to Talleyrand, the French envoy, at the first conference, September 30, "The object of this meeting is to let you know what the four powers have been doing." They gave him the official report of their proceedings, in which they gave themselves the name of *Allies*. Talleyrand protested that this term shut out France from any share in the concert. He asked reproachfully whether they regarded themselves as still at war with France, that they should thus agree apart on terms to be imposed on her, as had been done in 1814.

Talleyrand thereupon demanded the opening of the congress according to the promise made by the Allies and the appointment of a committee to *prepare* the questions which the congress alone had the right to *decide*. His policy was to rally the little states around France in order to oppose the Allies. He succeeded in bringing about a declaration that the congress should open on the first of November, with the amendment "according to the principles of public law"; his plan being, by means of invoking international law and legitimacy or the rights of legitimate sovereigns, to prevent the Allies from making a new division of the conquered territory. "The King," he said, "will not admit that mere conquest can give sovereignty." He accordingly took under his protection the legitimate King of Saxony and refused to recognise Murat as King of Naples. He also succeeded in getting the preparatory committee made up of representatives of the four Allies and of the four other states which had signed the treaty of Paris—France, Spain, Portugal, and Sweden. But these formal concessions amounted practically to nothing; for the congress never was opened, and the four Allies alone made the settlements.

Territorial Settlements.—England kept, of her conquests, Malta, the Ionian Islands, Heligoland, and, outside of Europe, the Cape, Ceylon, and the Ile de France. Austria took the Illyrian provinces and the districts ceded to Bavaria, indemnifying Bavaria with the Palatinate on the left bank of the Rhine. In this way England and Austria were satisfied without opposition. The settlement of the Netherlands and Italy was made without discussion. Belgium was united to Holland to form the kingdom of the Netherlands, which was given to the Prince of Orange. In Italy, Austria added to the Milanese, Venetia and the Valteline; the King of Sardinia received the former republic of Genoa; the rest of the formerly existing states were re-established.

Poland and Germany now remained to be disposed of, and as to these the Allies were divided. The Tsar wished to keep the whole Grand Duchy of Warsaw, that is to say, all Prussia's share in the two partitions of Poland of 1793 and 1795. Prussia did not insist on getting back her part of Poland, preferring to be indemnified by the annexation of the Kingdom of Saxony. This she alleged might be regarded as vacant territory, for it had been conquered from Napoleon's ally, the King of Saxony, who had not had time, like the other German princes, to secure his estates by signing a treaty with the Allies. The Tsar, welcoming this solution, accused the King of Saxony of "treason to the European cause" in accepting the Grand Duchy from Napoleon. Prussia and Russia, acting together, therefore proposed to annex Saxony, compensating its King with vacant territories in Germany. But to this scheme England, and especially Austria, could not agree; it would advance the Tsar too far into Europe and give Prussia too great a power in Germany. Talleyrand, while pretending to uphold the cause of the legitimate King of Saxony against the "revolutionary" pretensions of Prussia, took advantage of the disagreement between the Allies to secure a defensive alliance between England, Austria, and France. He wrote to the King: "Now the coalition is dissolved, and forever" (January, 1815). In reality, his intervention served only to plant a Prussian army on the French frontier. The Prussian representatives would have preferred to avoid a direct contact between France and Prussia; they therefore proposed to make the left bank of the Rhine into a state for the King of Saxony. This would have been a Catholic state under a sovereign naturally

allied to France. The Tsar approved the scheme; the two other Allies refused it, and Talleyrand helped them to defeat a combination of such evident advantage to France. At last they appointed a Committee of Statistics which selected four pieces of territory to make up the indemnity for Prussia; to make up the 3,400,000 souls which were owing her, they assigned her first a province of Poland, Posen (810,000 souls); second, the left bank of the Rhine (1,044,000); third, Westphalia (829,000); fourth, a part of the Kingdom of Saxony (782,000). The Tsar kept the rest of Poland and promised to make it into a kingdom with a constitution.

The other territorial changes were made by special treaties; Sweden ceded Pomerania to Prussia, which in turn ceded Lauenburg to Denmark in exchange for Norway joined to Sweden.

Before these arrangements were completed came the news of Napoleon's return. The plenipotentiaries arranged to declare in the name of Europe that "Napoleon Bonaparte had placed himself outside the pale of civil and social relations, and as an enemy and disturber of the peace of the world, had made himself an outlaw"; they promised to protect the King of France or any other government from his attacks (March 13, 1815). They then hastened to prepare "the final act of the congress." It was signed by the eight states which had composed the "preparatory commission," and the others were "invited to give in their adhesion." They inserted a provision for the free navigation of rivers and a guarantee of the neutrality of the Netherlands and Switzerland.

After Waterloo the Allies renewed their secret conferences to decide what pledges they should take of France. They all agreed to demand military occupation, a money indemnity, and some cessions of territory. But on the extent of these cessions they could not agree. The two German states Prussia and Austria, being more directly threatened, demanded Alsace, and even Lorraine and French Flanders. England and the Tsar approved only the restitution of Savoy to the King of Sardinia and some rectifications of frontier that should deprive France of certain fortresses. Austria agreed; the King of Prussia, left alone, threatened, then yielded. Then the Allies came to an understanding on the *ultimatum* to be imposed on France (September 20). With some modifications obtained by France, this became the treaty of Paris.

At the same time the Allies made a permanent league "for

the safety of their states and the general tranquillity of Europe." They agreed to take measures in common, if revolutionary principles should again "rend France and threaten the quiet of other states."

Europe after the Settlements of 1815.—The settlements of Vienna had been made according to the diplomatic principles of the eighteenth century, the *balance of power* and the system of *compensations*. France, regarded as too powerful, was reduced to her old territory, so as to restore the *equilibrium*. The other great powers could receive only indemnities in exchange for territories ceded to other states. But two great powers were made exceptions: England kept Malta and the Ionian Isles; Russia kept Bessarabia, Finland, and Poland. Both gained by their wars against France a net increase of territory at the expense either of suppressed states (Venice and Malta) or of old allies of France (Sweden, Turkey, and Poland). Austria and Prussia received only compensations, but reckoned from their time of greatest territorial extent, that is, after the last partition of Poland. Austria received the territory of Venice to make up for the loss of her Netherlands and Salzburg to make up for the loss of her old domains in Swabia. Prussia received in place of her Polish regions, so difficult of assimilation, three purely German districts—Westphalia, Saxony, and the Rhine province; in exchange for Lauenburg she gained Swedish Pomerania. Both Austria and Prussia, therefore, found themselves with a territory, if not greater, at least more compact than in 1795. The German princes retained the territories secularized or mediatized in the time of Napoleon. The small states favoured by the Allies received increase of territory. The Prince of Orange got Belgium, and the King of Sardinia, Genoa; Switzerland, the Bernese Jura and a fragment of Savoy. These increases were made at the expense of the small states that had no reigning families, the republics of Genoa and Venice, the ecclesiastical states, the German free cities and also at the expense of two of Napoleon's allies, Saxony and Denmark. All the ecclesiastical states of Europe disappeared except that of the Pope. The Holy See protested against this decision of the lay diplomats of Vienna as it had formerly condemned the original secularizations following the Peace of Lunéville in 1803.

Thus the work of the congress was not a simple restoration; of the overturnings of the revolutionary period the Allies accepted those that pleased them, those that injured no lay prince;

and from the territories thus left vacant they carved out compensations and extensions for themselves. All these changes were made according to the practice of the eighteenth century, without consulting the inhabitants and with no thought for their interests. The diplomatists represented governments, but not peoples.

The system thus established rested, as in the eighteenth century, on the balance of power between five great powers—two western, France and England; three eastern, Russia, Austria, and Prussia. Neither of these was strong enough to control Europe nor even to make war against the rest. The balance of power did indeed maintain itself for a half-century and the peace of Europe for forty years. Between the two groups was a central region divided into small states, those of Germany and of Italy, the Netherlands and Switzerland, the two latter being declared neutral by the guarantee of the great powers. The house of Hapsburg controlled the two regions of small states—Italy through the Austrian possessions, Germany through the influential position of the Emperor; and, not needing extension for herself, she was interested in maintaining the small states. In the east, Russia had absorbed the territory which formerly separated her from Europe; of the old state of Poland there remained but Cracow, set up as an aristocratic republic. Sweden, despoiled of Finland and Pomerania, was confined to the Scandinavian region. The Ottoman Empire remained outside of the European system.

The restoration of the balance of power in Europe brought with it a restoration of the old governments. The states revolutionized by the French armies were given back to their former sovereigns to restore the *old régime*. Absolute monarchy became the normal form of European government. The only states where the sovereign was limited by a constitution were the constitutional monarchies of England, France, and the Netherlands, the aristocratic republics united in the Swiss Confederation, Norway, and the new Kingdom of Poland. All these constitutions still left the real power to a sovereign or a small aristocracy. But the experience of the Revolution and revolutionary ideas had, all over Europe, given to certain men a desire for a more liberal or more democratic form of government, and these political malcontents formed themselves into *liberal* parties, opposing the political systems restored in 1814. The distribution of territory at Vienna having been made regardless of the wishes of the popu-

lations concerned, certain states did not correspond to nations. Three nations, Germany, Italy, and Poland, were parcelled out between several states. One single state, Austria, united several uncongenial nations in an artificial relation. This system produced malcontents who tended to form *national* parties. The liberal and national malcontents, united ordinarily into a single opposition party, worked therefore to undo the work of the diplomats; and, as governments arrange for mutual support, so the oppositionists in each country felt themselves drawn toward those in the other countries and sought co-operation with them.

More than all the rest, the Austrian government was interested in checking these national and liberal movements, which threatened at once its interior organization and its influence in Germany; the head of the Austrian government, Metternich, became therefore naturally the leader of the resistance. He called all his opponents *revolutionists* because they invoked the principles set forth during the French Revolution, sovereignty of the people, liberty, and equality. He sums up the situation thus: "The object of these factions is one and the same, the overthrow of every legally existing institution. . . The principle which the monarchs must set against this . . . is the preservation of every legally existing institution." Between the conservative governments, masters of power, and the opposition parties, liberals, nationalists, and democrats, began in all countries the struggle which forms the political history of Europe in the nineteenth century.

BIBLIOGRAPHY.

For the history of the facts treated in this chapter a reliable bibliography will be found in **Dahlmann-Waitz**, "Quellenkunde der Deutschen Geschichte," 6th edit., revised by Steindorff, 1894; pp. 544, 549-50.

SOURCES.—The leading sources are:

ON THE INVASIONS.—"Correspondance de Napoléon I.," 1858-70.—**W. Oncken**, "Oesterreich und Preussen im Befreiungskriege," 1876-79 (documents in the appendix).—**Metternich-Winneburg**, "Oesterreichs Theilnahme an den Befreiungskriegen," 1887, taken from Austrian documents.

ON THE CONGRESS OF VIENNA.—**J. L. Kluber**, "Akten des Wiener Kongresses," 8 vols., 1815-35, collection of official acts.—**G. Pallain**, "Correspondance Inéd. de Talleyrand et du Roi," 1881, accounts of the work of the congress from the French point of view.—"Memoirs and Correspondence of Castlereagh," 12 vols. in 3 series, 1848-53.—"Despatches of Wellington," 8 vols., 1844-47.—"Supplementary Despatches and Memoranda," 15 vols., 1858-72. The Wellington despatches give a history of the congress

from the English point of view.—**Pozzo di Borgo**, "Corresp. Diplom. du Comte Pozzo di Borgo," 1890, from the Russian point of view.—The German documents, **Münster**, **Stein**, **Gagern** (see Dahlmann-Waitz), are of less importance.

WORKS.—FOR A GENERAL ACCOUNT.—**W. Oncken**, "Das Zeitalter der Revolution, des Kaiserreiches und der Befreiungskriege," vol. ii., 1887 (Oncken collection), is still the most reliable general history. In English, **Fyffe**, "Modern History," 3 vols., begins at 1792.

In French, **Gervinus**, "Hist. du XIX^e Siècle," translated from the German (in the original, vol. i., 1855), detailed, but ill provided with references.

ON THE INVASIONS.—**H. Houssaye**, "1814" and "1815," 1888-93.

ON THE CONGRESS AND THE TREATIES.—**Angeberg**, "Le Congrès de Vienne et les Traités de 1815," 1864; **Bernhardi**, "Gesch. Russlands und der Europäischen Politik," vol. i., 1863 (coll. of contemporary histories); these are the two most detailed accounts of negotiations, but neither of them was able to make use of the documents with which we are acquainted to-day.—**A. Sorel**, "Les Traités de 1815," 1873.—**A. Debidour**, "Hist. Diplom. de l'Europe," 1874-78, vol. i., 1891.—**Seeley**, "Life of Stein."—**Hertalet**, "Map of Europe by Treaty."

ENGLAND.

CHAPTER II.

ENGLAND BEFORE THE REFORM OF 1832.*

ENGLAND in the nineteenth century has served as a political model for Europe. The English people developed the political mechanism of modern Europe, constitutional monarchy, parliamentary government, and safeguards for personal liberty. The other nations have only imitated them. The parties that distinguish the political life of the nineteenth century (conservative, liberal, radical, and socialist) were constituted in England before appearing in other countries. It is therefore natural to begin the political history with England.

ENGLAND BEFORE THE REFORM BILL.

The United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland emerged in 1814 from a long war, almost continuous since 1793, which had enlarged its colonial empire and strengthened its internal organization. The "Old England" of the eighteenth century stood firm; having had no revolution, it needed no restoration. In order to understand this "Old England" it is necessary to know the organization of the English government, the composition of English society, and the special condition of Ireland.

The public life of Great Britain centred in three groups of old institutions, so long united that they seemed inseparable: the central government, the local authorities, and the Church.

The Central Government.—The central government of England, extending since 1707 to Scotland and since 1800 to Ireland, was made up officially of three parts, the King assisted by the Privy Council, the House of Lords, and the House of Commons. These were ancient bodies, whose relations to each other had been settled by custom and tradition.

The King, hereditary and inviolable, remained the legal ruler

* The chapters on England have been freely revised and in part rewritten.—S. M. M.

of the kingdom. As representative of the state he made peace, war, and treaties. As fountain of justice he appointed the judges, who decreed justice in his name. As head of the government he appointed all officers, summoned Parliament, and dissolved it; his assent was necessary to the enactment of laws. He had still in law the same rights as his predecessors in the Middle Ages; and, like those, he had to assist him in governing a council whose members he appointed.

The powers of the King, of the Council, and of the Parliament had been settled by usage. The English people had neither a written constitution nor had their laws been reduced to a code; and of these facts they were proud.* Their political constitution rested on precedent and tradition, and their common law on custom. In form the King was still the sole head of the government and everything was done in his name. Parliament was only an aid for him, and was unable even to meet without his order; the ministers were only his advisers. But three customs established in the eighteenth century had radically transformed his position.

1. The King, though invested with all the powers, exercised none of them personally. Every political act ordered by the King had to be ordered through a minister who assumed the responsibility for it. The King no longer governed; he let his ministers govern in his name.

2. The ministers did not act singly; they met in cabinet council to decide on matters of state. This meeting had no legal recognition; even to-day the term *cabinet* cannot be used in an official act. But in fact the meeting of ministers charged with governing in the name of the King had become the principal organ of the state. The Cabinet not being an official body, the number of its members has never been fixed; it varies from twelve to nineteen. Since the eighteenth century the ministry has been regarded as a unit, made up of men of one mind regarding public policy. One of the members acts as head and speaks for the ministry as a whole; he is called the *prime minister*, but this is only a popular name. As late as 1806 it was said that "the English constitution abhors the idea of a prime minister."

3. The King in appointing the ministry did not act on his own judgment; personally he was not responsible. By a constitutional fiction the King can do no wrong. If wrong be done by his order, the act is that of his evil advisers, and they alone

* Arthur Young in 1789 ridiculed certain Frenchmen who imagined there is "a receipt for making a constitution."

are responsible. The responsibility thus borne by the ministers was held to be to Parliament. In practice a ministry could remain in office only so long as it had the confidence of a majority in the House of Commons. If the House wished to end a ministry, it could do so without needing even to bring formal charges against it. It was enough to refuse supplies or to pass a vote of censure. The King was thus indirectly compelled to take for ministers the leaders of the party having a majority in the House of Commons. Not, however, in the sense that these leaders must all be Commoners: it was customary still to take at least as many ministers from the House of Lords as from the House of Commons. Thus, the King having yielded the control to his ministry, and the ministry having become a delegation of the party in control of the Commons, it was the House of Commons that indirectly exercised the royal power.

If the power of the House of Commons had been confined to voting the budget and passing bills, it would have remained a subordinate authority like the representative chamber in continental monarchies (Prussia and Austria). Not by the exercise of its legislative power, recognised by law, but by appropriating to itself a customary right of controlling the royal administration, has it established Parliamentary government. That *régime* consists in transferring the substance of the royal power to the majority in Parliament, leaving the King only a pre-eminence in dignity: "the King reigns, but does not govern."

Parliamentary government seems to-day so characteristic of English ways that one easily forgets how recent a growth it is. It existed under the first two Georges (1714-1760), but the practice was not definitely settled, and even the theory was not frankly admitted by George III. The first two Georges had been pleased to take their ministers from the majority in Parliament, and to follow their advice. But the action of these two kings did not alter the legal right of the Crown (the *prerogative*); it was open to their successors to resume the legal right. George III. asserted this position, and during the first half of his long reign (1760-1820) he strove to return to the older practice, which accorded with the official theory of a balance between the three powers, King, Lords, and Commons. He did not admit without qualification any of the new usages. He wished to preside personally at Cabinet meetings, and to be his own prime minister. He refused his assent to measures that were personally distasteful to him although urged by his ministers. He repeatedly asked

ministers to resign because he disapproved their policy. He tried long to prevent the growth of unity in the Cabinet, by systematically drawing ministers from different political groups. He did not think it necessary to take as ministers the leading men of the Parliamentary majority.

In his struggle against Parliamentary government, George III. was helped by the Parliament itself. The old Royalist party, now become the Tory party, continued to uphold the power of the King. They had opposed the first two Georges, not as kings, but as alien usurpers. Now that all thoughts of a restoration of the Stuarts were at an end, and a genuinely English king was on the throne,—a king, moreover, who had no fondness for the Whigs,—the Tories speedily resumed their natural position as supporters of the royal power. The new Parliamentary group known as King's Friends was mainly recruited from their ranks. The popular disgust at the selfish and corrupt manner in which the Whig leaders, with the honourable exception of Lord Chatham, had used their control of the government, did not escape the notice of the new King and his friends. To the popular apprehension Walpole, Pelham, and Newcastle seemed to have used their power in the state to load their friends and supporters with offices, pensions, and preferments. But there was another phase of their conduct which interested the King much more deeply than this. They had shown how easily, by means of the patronage and other favours in the gift of the Crown, a majority could be gained and kept in the House of Commons; and how, by the use of this majority, the personal wishes of the King himself could be overborne, and subjected to the will of the Whig chiefs. George III. was quick to read the lesson the Whigs had set for him; but he was sagacious enough to read it in a sense they had not intended. If the great Whig families, by the use of patronage and favours, could control a majority in the House of Commons to overbear the King, obviously the King might use the same method to overbear the great Whig families, and thus regain the personal authority his grandfather and great grandfather had allowed to slip from their hands. The first twenty-five years of his reign bear witness to the persistent and sometimes unscrupulous skill with which he strove to realize this design. Accepting, in form, the supremacy of the House of Commons, he laboured steadily, using his patronage, his court influence, and even his money, to create and keep there a majority favourable to his own views of public policy. Accepting, too, the

principle that the king must act by the advice of his ministers, he sought to give the principle a new application, by getting ministers who should give only such advice as was agreeable to him.

Working on this plan he had, for about twenty years, at least a moderate degree of success. The disastrous outcome of the struggle with the American colonies, brought on and managed by ministers chosen on the new principle, brought discredit and collapse on his system. But the Whigs had neither the will nor the capacity to turn the crisis to account for the nation by insisting on national control of national affairs. The alternative they offered for court influence was the influence of the great Whig families; George III. should cease to dispense patronage, pensions, and other means of corrupting the House of Commons, and Charles James Fox should do those things in his stead. On that issue there was little at stake to arouse public interest; probably, considering the private character of Fox, the balance of opinion favoured the King. At all events, when presently Fox allied himself with Lord North in order to coerce the King, the nation met him with an emphatic repudiation.

The rout of the old-family Whigs at the general election of 1784 is a singular passage in English history. To the men of the time it seemed that George III. had won a decisive victory for his system. In reality, as the sequel showed, the result was as fatal to George III.'s system as it was to the aims of the aristocratic Whigs. The real victory belonged to the nation, and to its newly found leader, the younger Pitt. That able and self-reliant young man was beginning the remarkable career which was to demonstrate, once for all, the overwhelming advantages, both for King and people, of a Parliamentary ministry, resting on the national will. His popularity enabled him to dispense with the old corrupt methods of securing support. It also enabled him to advise the King with an authority that even George III. could not safely ignore. He was able to win the royal assent to every project that he cared to press, until a question arose which touched the warped and sensitive conscience of the King, and on which the nation was not ready to support the enlightened policy of the minister. When Pitt resigned on the Catholic question in 1801, the principle of Cabinet government was well established. If George III. did not publicly avow the principle, he at least found it convenient to act on it.

Local Government.—Even the composition of the Parliament was governed by tradition. The House of Commons was

elected, not by the nation, but by privileged local bodies. Thus the central government was allied to local institutions.

In England, the local government was irregularly organized and, contrary to the opinion now become classic, it was weak. The self-government so boasted of by England was confined to the old cities and privileged boroughs, each administered by an old municipal corporation elected by hereditary burgesses. All the rest of the country, all the villages and all the new cities, were without elected local administration. In these, local affairs were managed by the *vestry* or parish meeting and church wardens, presided over by the rector and the squire. It was the justices of the peace, appointed by the government from among the gentry, who, without compensation, undertook the management of the police, of the assessment of taxes, and even of justice, sometimes working singly, sometimes meeting in session to deliberate together. Each was master in his own district, without other check than the right of aggrieved persons to appeal to the ordinary tribunals against his action.

There was still for each county a lord lieutenant, formerly commander of the militia, also taken from among the great landowners of the county, but now reduced to mere ceremonial functions. The original character of the English local administration was not to employ salaried officers; all the work was done gratuitously by the prominent men of the county. The twelve judges of the three Common Law Courts were the only judges remunerated by the state. These were concentrated in the capital, going about the country only to hold jury trials and to hear appeals from the local justices. There were no permanent local courts except those of the justices of the peace in Petty and Quarter Sessions.

This English self-government was not therefore the government of the country by itself, but the government of the country by the local aristocracy.

The Electoral System.—It was the local bodies that sent the representatives to the House of Commons. There were three classes of these constituencies: the *counties*, electing 186 members; the *boroughs*, electing 467 members; and the *universities*, electing 5 members. The boroughs were not ordinarily electoral districts, but privileged bodies, very unequally distributed, without regard either to population or to territory. Scotland had only 45 members, Wales 24; Ireland, incorporated with Great Britain in 1800, had 100 members. In England the privileged

boroughs were chiefly in the south; 10 southern counties had 237 members, the other 30 counties had only 252. The poor and backward county of Cornwall had 44, lacking only one of having as many as all Scotland.

Till 1832 there had been no law designating the places to be represented. The actual selection had been made by successive kings down to Charles II., in whose reign the King lost the right of creating new boroughs by the mere issue of his writ of election. Neither had there been any law determining who, in each borough, should have the right to elect the members. In many boroughs the royal charter of incorporation had ordained that the election should be made by the members of the corporation. As the corporation, in these cases, was a "close" body and had usually fallen under the control of a single family, the head of that family was able to designate the two members for the borough. In another class of boroughs the corporation was able to control the election though not itself entitled to elect; the right of election belonged to the "freemen" of the place, and the corporation had the right of naming the freemen. It regularly named only such as would be likely to obey its wishes. In a third class of boroughs—some of them without inhabitants—the right of election had become vested in the owners of certain plots of ground within the borough. Any rich man who bought or inherited a majority of these plots could name the two members for the borough. In still another class of boroughs the government of the day was able, through offices and other influences, to secure the election of its chosen candidates.

It is stated by Dr. Oldfield in his "Representative History" that, out of 658 representatives, 487 were chosen, in one way or another, by patrons. The election in these cases was a mere form.

The English counties, and some of the large boroughs in which the householders or the taxpayers had the right of voting, were the only constituencies in which real elections were held. Even in some of these it was no uncommon thing to dispense with the formality of an election. On the day fixed for the nomination of candidates there appeared only as many as there were seats to be filled. The prominent men of the county having agreed on the men to be put in nomination, the sheriff had only to declare these elected. This was what was called an *uncontested* election, and many of the county elections were conducted in just this way.

Ordinarily at a general election there were not more than fifty

constituencies which were really contested. In 1818 the struggle was considered very hot because there were 100 *contested* elections. In all the counties of Scotland there were not 3000 voters in all. In Bute County (14,000 inhabitants, 21 voters) they tell the story of an election at which only *one* voter appeared; he constituted the assembly, by electing himself as chairman, made a speech in favor of his own election, put his name to the vote, and declared himself unanimously elected.

The *contested* election was held under old disorderly forms. On nomination day, in presence of the crowd, gathered sometimes in the open air, the sheriff put the question on the candidates one by one, and the crowd voted on each by shouting and by raised hands in the midst of much confusion. The real electors were mixed in right and left with non-electors, who, of course, also raised their hands. This was a mere farce. The defeated candidate had the right to demand a *poll*. Then the real election began. A poll-book was opened in which each voter had the right to have his vote inscribed; this operation could go on for forty days (reduced in 1784 to fifteen). The inhabitants of the place were interested in prolonging the polling, for in a hotly contested election the price of votes was sure to go up. The vote being public and recorded in a book, the magnates could effectively buy or threaten the voters. This was unlawful, but was done without much concealment. Some boroughs in which the corporation elected the members put their seats on sale. In others the proprietors of the land on which the borough stood dictated their choice to the inhabitants, their tenants; in 1829, at Newark, the Duke of Newcastle turned out 587 of his tenants for having dared to vote for the other candidate. This was complained of in the House, and the Duke replied: "Have I not the right to do as I wish with my own?"

Pitt had proposed in 1785 a timid reform which consisted in buying up the seats of 36 rotten boroughs, to be assigned to the counties. He could not get it passed. The elections remained corrupt, and the parvenus, bankers, manufacturers, and "nabobs," taking advantage of this to buy the position of member of Parliament, gave another increase to the prices of seats.

In 1814 the greater number of seats were simply acquired by inheritance; by purchase, or by family influence. The House was representative only in name; it was an assemblage of landlords, millionaires, and their nominees, independent of the mass of the nation. The sovereignty belonged to the King and the aristoc-

racy. The Parliamentary system was not a representative government, but an oligarchical government.

The Church.—The organization of the Church was very complicated. Without counting the sects, the United Kingdom was divided between three churches, each predominating in one of the three countries: the Anglican Church in England, the Presbyterian in Scotland, and the Roman Catholic in Ireland. Of these only two were officially recognised, the Anglican as the Church of England, and the Presbyterian as the Church of Scotland; the Catholic Church was only tolerated in fact.

The Established Church was the only one officially protected and endowed. The English government, nevertheless, granted absolute freedom of worship. The only restriction laid upon Dissenters was from holding public office, and this was in practice set aside by the Annual Indemnity Act, passed each year by Parliament.

The Roman Catholics enjoyed substantially the same legal toleration as the Protestant Dissenters. They were, however, debarred from holding public office and from sitting in either House of Parliament by the requirement of the oath of supremacy and the declaration against transubstantiation. In 1807 George III. dismissed the Grenville ministry for refusing to promise never to renew the proposition they had made looking to the admission of Roman Catholics to offices in the army and navy.

The Anglican Church kept up its ecclesiastical courts, where were tried not only matters of church discipline, but lay cases of divorce, validity of marriage, and administration of wills. It also had the exclusive right to perform marriages, and it registered births and deaths.

The Church maintained its established position. Besides the income from its own estates, it had an annual revenue from tithes and church rates. The tithe was a tenth part of the produce of all lands, whether held by Churchmen or others; the church rate was a tax imposed, by vote of the parish vestry, on all rate-payers, whether Churchmen or not. The tithes went for the support of the clergy; the rates were levied for the maintenance and care of the buildings, grounds, etc., belonging to the Church. The Church maintained its ancient hierarchy: the archbishops and bishops, the chapters of cathedrals, the archdeacons, appointed by the government, and the parsons, appointed by the *patrons*, who were either the bishop, the Lord Chancellor, the chapter, or,

as was usually the case, a layman who owned the advowson of the living. In fact, the clergymen were usually the younger sons of the great families, who, with the income from their parishes, continued to live like gentlemen, hunting and riding, exercising the functions of justice of the peace, and bringing up a family. Many did not even reside in their parish, but left it in charge of a curate, an ecclesiastic taken from the ranks of the lower middle class, whom they paid with a small portion of their own income.

The Church of Scotland held, and still holds to this day, its old federative constitution recognised by the Act of Union in 1707. Each parish forms a body governed by the pastor and the lay elders. A group of parishes unites to form a presbytery, governed by the united body of pastors and an elder from each parish. The meeting of the members of several presbyteries makes what is called a Synod. Finally, at the head of this hierarchy, the General Assembly, composed of delegates from each presbytery, each royal borough, and each university, is the supreme power of the Established Church of Scotland. All these assemblages are courts of discipline having power of censorship over the faith and the private life of the pastors and the faithful; the presbytery is practically the strongest power.

The Church of Scotland, in the eighteenth century, had assumed a tyrannical supervision over the private life of the parishioners; but the government and the lay tribunals, by refusing to recognise its right to discipline private individuals in matters of conduct, had succeeded in restricting it to questions of religion (to await the conflict with the state which, in 1843, was to bring about the secession of the Free Church).

Its revenues consisted of the tithes, the church rate, and private donations (the latter amounting to almost one-half).

The Church of Scotland, always poor, paid its members little, but it knew neither the enormous inequality between the incomes of the various pastors, nor the undisguised sale of livings so common in the Church of England; the Scotch clergy were more independent and more active than the English.

Social Conditions.—English society was based on the distinctions between rich and poor: those who had possessions had all the rights, private and political; those who had nothing were shut out from all public life, and even from some of the securities for personal liberty. They were as two separate nations placed one over the other, the one privileged, the other disinherited.

The authors who described English political life or who theo-

rized about it, knew only the privileged nation; they believed the English to be all equal before the law, all protected by the law. And, indeed, the official political acts made no distinctions, as in other countries, between nobles and commons; the Bill of Rights spoke for the "rights of the English people" without class distinctions. But, in fact, custom and some special laws little known to the public had finally formed under the legal nation a lower class, shut out from political rights.

The constitution forbade compulsory military service; but in reality the government, when there was need of sailors for the royal navy, got them by force, seizing sailors, and even some that were not sailors at all. This was called impressment. It was practised only on the poor.

The constitution did not admit that manual labour entailed any loss of the rights of an English subject. But Parliament, made up of landowners and employers, had made laws which put the labouring classes in the power of their employers.

A series of laws from the sixteenth to the eighteenth century had created the legal category of the poor, and the local tax called the poor-rate. Whoever had no independent means of support was kept at the expense of the parish and came under the authority of the overseers of the poor. These overseers had the power to set them at any sort of work and, if they refused it, to shut them up in the workhouse, and to put their children out as apprentices wherever they pleased; this meant, in practice, selling them to manufacturers to make them work in the factories. The poor man could not freely change his dwelling-place, for every parish had the right of denying a settlement to anyone who was likely to become a public charge. Now, as nearly all the lands of England belonged to the gentry, the English peasants had ordinarily no means of self-support; so the greater number of them fell into the class of assisted poor, numbering 1,340,000 in 1811, 2,500,000 in 1821, and 1,850,000 in 1827.

The constitution recognised the right of forming unions and clubs. The city artisans had had their trade guilds protected by regulations which fixed the maximum number of apprentices and the minimum of wages. But when the factory system arose, and crowds of labourers were gathered in new places, the employers held themselves free from old regulations favouring the labourers. Nor was this all. Parliament was induced to pass laws (1799-1800) which forbade artisans, under penalty of several months' imprisonment, to band themselves together for an in-

crease of pay. It became a misdemeanour for workmen to club together, and a justice of the peace had the power to send them to jail for it.

Thus sailors, farm labourers, paupers, workmen, thrust outside of common rights, at the mercy of press-gangs, overseers of the poor, employers, and justices of the peace, formed an inferior nation, without political power, without assured means of existence, without guarantee of personal liberty.

From this disinherited class came many criminals, notably robbers. To suppress these Parliament had passed fierce laws pronouncing the penalty of death for more than 200 acts declared to be felonies; for example, poaching on game preserves and shop-lifting were capital crimes.

The whole nation, in the contemplation of the law, was swayed by two rival aristocracies: that of landed proprietors, allied with the clergy, supreme in the country parts; and that of capitalists and great manufacturers, supreme in the cities. These were economic masters of the country.

There remained in 1815 almost no independent peasants, small landed proprietors, or tenants on lease; all lands had finally been absorbed into great estates, belonging to lords or squires. These let out their lands to farmers, who had them cultivated by hired labourers. A village was simply a group of cottages occupied by these workmen, where the lord or squire acted as master. Grain was still England's chief product. In order to maintain an advantageous price, the proprietors had got the Corn Laws passed, which excluded foreign grain except in case of a scarcity and consequent high price. The price was fixed in 1791, at 50 shillings a quarter (8 bushels); but during the wars with France the price went up so far beyond this that they raised the figure to 63 shillings. After the peace, to offset foreign competition, they raised it again to 80 shillings. By these measures the income of land was doubled, to the benefit of the owner. Rents were raised, but not the wages of the labourers.

A similar concentration had taken place in manufacturing since the end of the eighteenth century. The industrial system had been revolutionized by two changes: 1st, the new machines driven by water or by steam, and the new mechanical arts, had created the factory system; 2d, small employers who produced directly for a single business house, were replaced by capitalist employers who produced on a large scale for the general market and for exportation. So was formed the new class of

large employers and wholesale merchants, who were added to the aristocracy of capitalists.

The factory system was moving the centre of the population of England. Until the eighteenth century all economic and political life had been in the south and east, near London; the north and west remained thinly populated and backward in civilization. But the factory system attracted population to the neighborhood of mines and streams in the north and west, where dense masses of workmen established themselves. England was divided into two regions: the south and east, remaining agricultural and controlled by the landowners, were the home of conservatism; the north and west, given over to manufacturing, were centres of political agitation. In Scotland, where manufacturing had begun, especially along the Clyde, Glasgow became a seat of activity rivalling Edinburgh, the capital.

The Condition of Ireland.—Ireland was inhabited by two nations of different origin: the native Irish, who were Catholic, and the settlers from England, and especially Scotland, most of whom were Anglicans or Presbyterians. The latter occupied only a part of the province of Ulster in the extreme north. The native Irish formed the population of the other three provinces, except the Pale in the neighbourhood of Dublin and a few other districts where early settlements of English had taken place. But since the conquest of the seventeenth century the native Irish were no longer masters even in their own region. Their religion was only tolerated by law; their clergy had neither official position nor right to tithes; they lived by the voluntary contributions of their parishioners. The Anglican Church was the State Church, recognised by law, supported by the income from its estates and tithes levied from all cultivators of the soil whether Protestant or Catholic. All political offices were closed to the Catholics; all the authorities, even the local justices of the peace, town councils, and juries, were Protestant—that is, in the eyes of the native Celts, foreign. The land belonged to English landlords who ordinarily did not live on their domains, but had them managed by agents or leased them to middlemen. The Irish peasant was not a landowner; he occupied, often for generations in the same family, a small farm on which he had built his cabin and which he cultivated subject to rent. But he had no vested right in the land; he was a tenant-at-will or at best a lease-holder. The landlord could evict him at pleasure, or at the end of his lease, without compensation. Population having greatly increased in the

eighteenth century, the land was subdivided to such a point that each tenant had barely enough ground to raise the necessary potatoes for himself and his family; the wretchedness of the Irish peasant had become proverbial.

In Ulster, peopled by Scotch Presbyterians, the tenants had a more stable tenure. Under the Ulster custom the landlords did not evict their tenants except in special cases and on payment of compensation for improvements.

Politically Ireland had been, until 1782, a dependency of Great Britain, subject to the King and the British Parliament, but with a Parliament of its own in Dublin. After 1782 the Irish Parliament had been allowed to legislate somewhat independently. It had repealed a part of the exceptional laws against the Catholics, and had allowed them to vote at elections. But Irish autonomy was destroyed at a blow by the Act of Union in 1800, passed by the Irish Parliament in spite of strong opposition on the part of many in Ireland. The Irish Parliament was suppressed; Ireland, swallowed up in Great Britain, had her representatives in the British Parliament, keeping her own electoral system, which allowed Catholics to vote and conferred the franchise on all leaseholders of land worth 40 shillings a year, that is to say, on almost every peasant. The representatives had to be Protestant, although the mass of Irish voters were Catholics. Ireland preserved her separate administration, the Lord Lieutenant and his Secretary, assisted by the Irish Privy Council.

Between the lower nation of Irish peasants and the superior nation of English or Scotch landlords the contrast was not shown in speech: the Irish, except in the west, had given up the Celtic language and adopted English. But difference of religion was sufficient to remind the Irish peasants of the foreign origin of their landlords. Thus the social and religious antipathy to the Protestant landlord took the form of a national sentiment among the Irish Celts.

AGITATION FOR REFORM.

The Reform Movement.—The system above described was of old origin, but it had been further consolidated in the years preceding 1814. The French Revolution, by alarming the ruling class, had filled them with a dread of every innovation and had prevented, for thirty years, the adoption of any reform. The wars against France had raised the national debt from £237,-

000,000 in 1791 to £816,000,000 in 1815: this added greatly to the political influence of the bankers and money lenders. The new industrial system had created an influential class of great manufacturers. The number of hired labourers was growing, and the gap between rich and poor was widening.

While France was ridding herself of her old *régime*, England was bracing herself to preserve hers. England was more thoroughly "old England" in 1814 than in 1789. This old England showed itself with features more clear-cut than ever—features so striking that one might easily take them for peculiarities of race inborn in the English nature: extreme contrast between rich and poor; a government monarchical and representative in appearance, but in reality controlled by an oligarchy of wealthy landowners; an aristocratic church, and a religion prescribed by law; hence, in public life, venality and corruption; in private life, luxury, pride, and formalism; hypocrisy on the part of the rich, misery, depression, and servility on the part of the poor; eagerness for titles and for the money necessary to get into good society—that state of mind which Thackeray described under the new name of *snob*.

This whole condition of things was sanctified by its antiquity. In contrast to the Frenchman of the time, the Englishman of the early days of the century respected every established institution because it was old; he despised every innovation because it was new. The theory of the sanctity of tradition, formulated by Burke, had become a dogma of the Anglican clergy, the gentry, and the universities. The English nation in 1814 was devoted to aristocracy and tradition. The Tory party, backed by the King and an enormous majority in the House of Commons, maintained its power without difficulty; the Liverpool Ministry lasted fourteen years (1812-27). The war over, the landholders, who made up the majority, put two measures through Parliament. The first forbade the importation of wheat unless the price went up to 10 shillings a bushel; a rule that ordinarily shut out foreign wheat, as the price of wheat was going down instead of going up. The second abolished the income-tax established during the war.

However, the peace brought a movement for reform. This showed itself in the large cities in the demonstrations of the Radicals; in Parliament in the form of bills brought forward by independent members. || Each of the more prominent Liberals consecrated himself to some special reform: Wilberforce to the

abolition of slavery, Romilly and Mackintosh to the amelioration of the penal code, Grattan and Burdett to Catholic emancipation, Grey and Russell to electoral reform, Brougham to educational and judicial reform. They knew that their motions had not the slightest chance of being passed by Parliament, but their plan was to bring forward their reforms incessantly, so as to rouse public interest in them. They did not confine their efforts to Parliament, for they set on foot outside agitation among the people. A public opinion among the masses on political questions began to manifest itself—a new thing for England.

In the eighteenth century, except in and about London, the public never aroused itself except for religious disputes, for wars, or against taxes. The awakening of public opinion was aided by a creation of the end of the eighteenth century: the great political newspapers had just been founded, the *Morning Chronicle* in 1769, the *Post* in 1772, the *Times* in 1785, the *Courier* in 1792. In their early stages these were a combination of advertisements and commercial news with some leading articles and Parliamentary reports. The government and Parliament viewed with dislike this new political power. Far from encouraging the press, they tried to hamper it by fiscal laws. The stamp duty on each sheet was raised from 2½ pence in 1789 to 4 pence in 1815; an import duty was placed on paper, which lasted until 1861. The press remained subject to old laws against seditious libel, which punished with imprisonment and sometimes transportation any attack on the King, the government, or religion; the opposition newspapers were always harassed with prosecutions. In 1812 the Hunt brothers were condemned to a year's imprisonment for saying that the *Morning Post* exaggerated in calling the Prince of Wales an Adonis. From 1808 to 1821, 94 journalists were condemned, 12 of them to transportation.

Journalists were held in contempt by the ruling class. As late as 1828 they were still disqualified for admission to the bar. Men in public life who wrote for the daily papers were unwilling to confess it. The press, however, was beginning to be a power. Certain Scots established in London had revolutionized the newspaper business by the rapidity with which they struck off copies. Walter, of the *Times*, by using a steam press, succeeded in printing 1500 copies an hour (1814). He had come to have 60 columns of advertisements. He had organized a special news service, and was thus able to defeat the government scheme of with-

holding letters sent to him by mail. Parliament, since 1770, had found itself obliged to tolerate the reporting of its debates by the newspapers. This was, and still is, the only means of publishing them, the English Parliament having neither stenographers nor official publication of its discussions. The press was thus becoming the intermediary between the Parliament and the public. Newspapers, burdened with the heavy stamp duty, remained a luxury; there were only six dailies in 1815, and the chief of them, the *Times*, sold only 8000 copies. But the sale was increasing, the total number of all newspapers paying stamp duty rose from 16,000,000 in 1801, to 25,000,000 in 1821, to say nothing of papers that evaded the duty. The great political reviews had just been founded, the *Edinburgh Review* (Whig) in 1808, the *Quarterly Review* (Tory) in 1809.

Political activity, suspended by the war, reawoke in 1814 in Parliament and the press. Then began a general attack on the old system maintained by the government and the Tory majority. With this was coupled a profound agitation in the world of labouring men. English industry, still in its infancy, was contending with limited capital and defective knowledge of the needs of the market. The manufacturers, feeling their way, sometimes produced in excess of the demand, sometimes fell far short of it; thus engaging at one time more workmen than they could employ regularly, and then later dismissing them. For thirty years England lived in a state of periodic crises (1816, 1819, 1826-29, 1837, 1842, 1848). Each crisis threw into idleness and misery a part of the workmen, especially the spinners and weavers in wool and cotton, who produced for exportation. The attendant suffering caused lawless outbreaks.

Radical Agitation and Repressive Laws (1816-19).—The peace did not bring the business revival which was expected; it was, on the contrary, followed by a crisis. The continental countries tried to shut out English products, so exportation went down; manufacturers, burdened with unsold goods, cut down wages, while the price of bread was raised by a bad harvest and the exclusion of foreign wheat. There was in 1816 a crisis of idleness and misery. The workmen thrown out of employment attributed their idleness to the new machinery which drove out hand labour; in some places they smashed the machines. This was not a new departure; in 1811 there had been outbreaks against machinery—the Luddite Riots, incited by a crazy man. The novelty was the political character of the uprising.

There had been in England since the eighteenth century a party working for radical political reform through universal suffrage, which now took the name, originated in England, of *Radical*. The party first appeared in 1769 in the Wilkes affair; it was organized in 1793, in sympathy with the French republicans, by the "Corresponding Society." The government persecuted it and broke it up, but its members clung secretly to their opinions. This was simply a group of men almost all living in London; but they made converts in the rising generation, and a new Radical party sprang up, of sufficient size to take part in political life. The intellectual centre was the group of disciples of Bentham, the utilitarian school, which contended against the old system in the name of right and the good of the greatest number. The most active member of the party was at first Cobbett, son of a peasant, editor of a popular newspaper, who wrote for the labouring classes. He attacked "the unproductive classes," bondholders, and clergy, and demanded a less costly religion and government.

All were agreed to consider Parliamentary reform the necessary precursor of all other reforms; before asking the House of Commons to interest itself in the fate of the poor classes, the House itself must first be made representative—representing the poor as well as the rich. The Radicals therefore claimed universal suffrage. Cobbett led the campaign by reducing the price of his paper, the *Weekly Register*, from a shilling to 2 pence (1816), and exhorting "all the artisans and workmen of England" to rise in a demand for universal suffrage. The newly elected Lord Mayor of London aided the reform movement by declaring, in an address to the Regent, that the only remedy for the crisis was reform.

To intimidate the government, the Radicals issued a call to discontented workmen. They organized the agitation on a grand scale; they got up monster outdoor meetings, public speeches, huge processions carrying banners with devices—things now become so common in English political life that they are readily taken for an old national custom. They had been employed before, but simply as a means of celebration for newly elected candidates. The Radicals used them as manifestations in favour of an abstract cause.

As early as 1816 came the characteristic demonstration at Spafield, near London. Placards invited all workmen in distress to meet and send a petition to the Regent and to the House

of Commons imploring them to take action. The meeting took place, and it was agreed to meet again to hear the answer. The promoters of the scheme had a placard made which thus summed up "the present state of Great Britain; four millions of people on the point of starvation, four millions with a bare subsistence, one and one-half millions in straitened circumstances, one-half million in dazzling luxury; our brothers in Ireland in a state even worse." At the second meeting (December, 1816) the speaker, Dr. Watson, mounted upon a carriage, waved the French tri-colour flag; this movement was therefore a combination of want and the French revolutionary spirit. The government had the meeting dispersed by soldiers. Then the Regent answered the reform petition by expressing his "surprise and grief," and, at the opening of Parliament, declared the English electoral system to be the most perfect the world had ever known. On his return from the House his carriage was pelted with stones. The government then formed a "committee of secrecy" in the House, and, presenting to it a report on the "practices, meetings, and combinations . . . evidently calculated to endanger the public peace," denounced the "conspiracy to overturn all the political institutions of the Kingdom and undermine the principle of private property." The House voted the suspension of the Habeas Corpus Act and gave to each justice of the peace the right to arrest, and detain without trial, writers and sellers of blasphemous or seditious publications. They aimed above all at the press, which one of the ministers called "a very dangerous enemy to the constitution." A law gave to the government the power to break up any meeting which incited hatred or contempt of the government or of the constitution. Refusal to disband was made a capital crime (1817).

As the destitution continued, the turbulence continued also. The workmen out of employment in Manchester set out on foot in a body for London, each man carrying a blanket. This "march of the Blanketeers." was stopped by force. In the manufacturing regions of the north, secret meetings were held at which there was talk of an armed rising. A mob partly armed marched on Nottingham, another made a night attack on some houses. There were some noisy state trials: that of Watson, who was acquitted, and that of Brandreth, leader of the Nottingham outbreak, who was convicted.

The program of the Radical party was definitively formulated in a bill laid before the House of Commons by Burdett, the sole

Radical member of the time.* universal suffrage, secret ballot, equal electoral districts, annual elections. This bill would have suddenly transferred the political power to the mass of the nation. Neither of the old political parties was willing even to discuss it. With the gradual return of better times, the Radical agitation fell off. At the elections of 1818 the Whig opposition increased from 140 to 170 members; but the Tory majority was still enormous. In 1819 a return of hard times brought a renewal of agitation by the Radicals, especially among the miners and weavers of the northwest, who suffered most from low wages and lack of employment. The centre of disturbance was now no longer London, but the neighbourhood of Manchester. As in 1816, the Radicals organized an enormous meeting, and drew up a petition for electoral reform. It covered five points: universal suffrage, secret ballot, annual Parliaments, pay of members, abolition of the property qualification for candidates.

At the meeting in St. Peter's Field ("Peterloo"), near Manchester, where were gathered 50,000 persons, they carried banners with the Phrygian cap, and the inscriptions: "No duty on corn," "Liberty or death" (motto of the French Revolution), "Equal representation or death." When "Orator Hunt" began to speak, the police tried to stop him, but the crowd defended him. Then a regiment of cavalry charged into the mob, and killed quite a number of persons (August, 1819). The Radicals retaliated with meetings to protest against the massacre and to make up subscriptions for its victims. The Common Council of London expressed its indignation against the "unjust and impolitic action" of the government and affirmed the "right of the English people to assemble and deliberate on public abuses." They accused the government of having violated one of the traditional liberties of England.

The ministers not only refused to make any investigation, but instituted proceedings against Hunt, on the charge of "conspiring to change the law by threats." They induced Parliament to pass a set of exceptional measures, the Six Acts, nicknamed the

* He was one of the members from Westminster, a borough in which the right of voting belonged to the "householders paying scot and lot." Being a royal residence and the seat of government, it was formerly counted a sure ministerial borough; but it had latterly become a favourite residence of city merchants and professional men, who, since 1780, were usually able to elect at least one of the two members. Charles James Fox represented the borough from 1780 till his death.—Tr.

"Gag Laws": 1st, speedy trial of offenders; 2d, prohibition of drilling; 3d, power given to justices of the peace to search houses for arms; 4th, right to seize every seditious or blasphemous libel, and to banish the author for a second offence (the government would have made it transportation); 5th, prohibition against holding public meetings "to examine into grievances in state and Church matters, and with the object of preparing petitions"; also against carrying at such a meeting arms, banners, or inscriptions; 6th, every political publication of less than two sheets to be subject to the stamp duty.

Every peaceful manifestation being prevented, some violent Radicals formed in London the Cato Street conspiracy to massacre the ministers; the government arrested them and hanged five of them (1820). Then, owing to revival of trade, the Radical agitation subsided.

Partial Reforms (1820-27).—George IV. having become King (January, 1820), the opposition turned upon him. His wife Caroline, from whom he had parted, and to whom he denied the title of queen, returned to England against his wish and was received with enthusiasm by the people. The ministry did not dare to insist upon obtaining from the House of Lords the divorce demanded by the King. George IV., held in contempt by reason of his extravagance, debts, and disorderly private life, had not as much influence with the ministry as his father had had, a fact favourable to Parliamentary government.

The Tory party retained an assured majority, but, now that the pressure of foreign war was removed, there arose a division of opinion within the party itself. Pitt's personal followers had never been opposed to reform on principle. The best representatives of these were George Canning, Huskisson, and, to a less degree, Sir Robert Peel. In 1821 Peel joined the ministry as Home Secretary; in 1822 Canning was taken in as Foreign Secretary, and in the same year Huskisson was made Chancellor of the Exchequer. From this date the policy of the ministry became more liberal. Canning detached England from the Holy Alliance by supporting the liberal movement in Portugal and recognising the new American republics in their revolt against Spain. Peel consented to bring before the House some legal reforms. Thus were made some partial reforms:

1. The reform of the criminal code, advocated by Romilly from 1808 to his death, had been rejected by the House of Lords. Peel carried the abolition of the death penalty for about a

hundred offences, such as shop-lifting, picking pockets, and poaching.

2. The economic system was modified by a series of measures carried by Huskisson. England had retained the Navigation Laws of 1651, which restricted the carrying trade between England and her colonies to English ships; and that between England and every other country to English ships or ships of that country. She was now threatened with retaliation by other countries. An act was passed authorizing the government to make treaties with foreign nations, putting their ships on the same footing with English ships (1823). The revenue having increased, the government was enabled to cut down the interest on the national debt, and to simplify the customs tariff by abolishing the duties on many articles and reducing the rates on many others.

Without attempting to abolish the duties on corn, the government secured the adoption of a sliding scale which allowed the importation of foreign corn when the price was at 66 shillings a quarter instead of 80 (1823). This was neither free trade nor even free trade in corn, but it was a breach in the system of prohibition.

3. The workmen, in order to better their condition, were forming among men of the same trade societies for mutual assistance, called Friendly Societies, or Trade Clubs, later Trade Unions; but as these associations fell under the law of 1800 against combinations, they frequently transformed themselves into secret societies, and even took the form of Masonic orders. The London workingmen, better organized and more inclined to political action, were in friendly relations with the Radicals, and sought to obtain freedom of association. Mr. Place, a wealthy tailor whose house was used as a place of meeting by the Radical workingmen, conducted the campaign skilfully. Mr. Hume, a Radical member of Parliament, prevailed on Peel and Huskisson to institute an inquiry into the economic effects of the three prohibitions pronounced by English laws against, 1st, emigration of workingmen; 2d, exportation of machinery; 3d, associations of workingmen. The question of the workingmen was thus slipped in under the shadow of the other two. The commission of inquiry heard evidence, skilfully presented, on the injury done to industry by the laws against unions. The commission was convinced and proposed to repeal these laws. Parliament voted the repeal without preceiving the full bearing of its action

(1824). But as soon as the workingmen used their liberty to join in strikes and demand an increase of wages, the manufacturers and shipowners demanded a repeal of the new law. A new committee of inquiry proposed to repeal the law of 1824, and the House, by way of compromise, adopted the law of 1825. This allowed combinations of workmen as well as employers, but solely "to determine the scale of wages or hours of labour" (not to limit the number of apprentices or to prevent piecework), and it imposed six months of hard labour on anyone who should resort to violence, threats, molestation, or obstruction, in order to secure a rise of wages. The judges interpreted this clause to extend to workmen on strike who reproached fellow workmen for continuing to labour. This was a half-liberty of association—a half-measure, like all the measures of this epoch.

At this time also began the great change in the means of communication. Clay roads were replaced by macadamized roads. The first railroad was built between Liverpool and Manchester in the years between 1825 and 1829.

Catholic Emancipation.—Since the union with Ireland in 1800, the laws regarding the Catholics had become contradictory. In England the old laws still existed which excluded them from every office and corporation, and accordingly prevented them from voting at elections or being elected. In Ireland, as already stated, they had been admitted to the right of voting in 1793: Irish Catholics, therefore, were in a better position than their coreligionists in England. The Irish patriots asked for the repeal of the exceptional laws against Catholics. The campaign had for a long time been conducted in Parliament in connection with a bill for the "relief of Catholics." As early as 1813 Grattan had it discussed in the House of Commons. But the party supporting the privileged position of the Anglican Church had succeeded in forming a decided majority to maintain the exclusion of the Catholics. Since then the project had been proposed every year, and always rejected; in 1821 it passed the Commons, but was rejected by the Lords. The royal family would not hear of it. George IV., like George III., declared himself bound by his coronation oath to maintain the Anglican Church; the Duke of York presented to the Lords a petition against the reform.

The decisive action came from the Irish Catholics. They founded the Catholic Association (1823), directed by a powerful orator, the lawyer O'Connell, who demanded in the name of liberty the abolition of the Catholic disabilities. Parliament

passed an act declaring this association unlawful. The Catholic Association dissolved itself, but came together again with a change of name.

The Tories were divided on the Catholic question. In 1825 the House of Commons passed a bill for removing the disabilities, but the Lords rejected it. The ministry itself was divided on the question. When Lord Liverpool retired on account of ill health, the new ministry, under Canning, favoured Catholic emancipation (1827). The new prime minister, however, died at the end of four months, and an attempt to carry on his ministry and policy under Lord Goderich came to nothing. In 1828 Wellington formed a ministry, divided among the old Tories, opposed to all reform, and the *Canningites*, friends of emancipation; but the *Canningites* soon withdrew.

In 1828, by way of substitute for the Annual Indemnity Act, proposed by the Wellington ministry, the Whigs obtained a vote of the Commons in favour of repealing the Test Act and the Corporation Act. The ministry, changing its attitude, brought in and carried a repealing bill in accordance with this vote (1828). But the exclusion of Catholics from seats in Parliament by the requirement of oaths depended, not on the Test Act, but on a special act passed in 1679; this special act remained in force, so that though Catholics could be appointed to office after 1828, they could not take a seat in either house of Parliament. It was, however, not illegal for Catholics to be nominated and elected. Taking advantage of this condition of things, O'Connell presented himself at a by-election in County Clare, and was triumphantly elected. The Irish peasantry had rebelled against their landlords as well as against the Catholic disabilities, and they had done so in a way that brought the government face to face with a most embarrassing and critical question.

At the re-assembling of Parliament, the Wellington ministry decided to propose the emancipation; the King had given his consent to this, but later withdrew it. The ministry therefore offered its resignation, and George IV. accepted it; but finding it impossible to form another ministry he was obliged to recall Wellington and Peel. An act, passed by a vote of 348 to 160, abolished the Catholic disabilities (1829). At the same time they raised the property qualification for voting in the Irish counties from £2 to £10 in order to shut out the tenants of small holdings.

The Electoral Reform of 1832.—The electoral reform demanded by the Whigs since the eighteenth century had been delayed by the extravagant claims of the Radicals. When Lord John Russell again took up the campaign in the name of the Whigs, it was not to propose a sweeping democratic reform. His scheme regarded the right of voting as a privilege. It merely proposed to extend largely the number of persons enjoying the privilege. It also proposed to take away the members from a large number of "rotten boroughs" and give them to the new cities. The Tory party was violently opposed. Little by little the project became popular; the Whig party increased in strength, while the Tories were weakened by internal dissensions between the Canningites and the old Tories.

In the House elected after the death of George IV. (1830), the Tories had but a slight majority, and the Canningite section of the party could no longer be relied upon to oppose reforms. The July Revolution in France greatly encouraged the advocates of reform in England. The movement began in the manufacturing regions of the north and west, now the most populous but least-represented portion of England. The centre of the movement was Birmingham, where the Political Union was formed for the purpose of carrying on the agitation. Wellington, the head of the ministry, did not appreciate the change in public opinion. Earl Grey, the leader of the Whigs in the House of Lords, made a speech in favour of Parliamentary reform. Wellington, in the course of his reply, said: "I have never read or heard of any measure up to the present moment which could in any degree satisfy my mind that the state of the representation could be improved, or be rendered more satisfactory to the country at large than at the present moment. . . I will go still further, and say that if at the present moment I had imposed on me the duty of forming a legislature for any country, and particularly for a country like this, in possession of great property of various descriptions, I do not mean to assert that I would form such a legislature as we possess now—for the nature of man is incapable of reaching it at once—but my great endeavour would be to form some description of legislature which would produce the same results" (November, 1830).

This declaration ruined the Tory ministry; on a question regarding the Civil List it was left in a minority in the Commons by a coalition of the Canningites with the Whigs. The new King, William IV., then appointed a reform ministry under Earl

Grey. The new ministry proposed a reform bill, providing, 1st, that 62 boroughs returning 119 members should lose the privilege; that 47 other boroughs should each lose 1 of its 2 members; Weymouth, returning 4 members, should lose 2. Of the 168 seats thus forfeited only 110 were redistributed; 5 were given to Scotland, 5 to Ireland, 1 to Wales, and the rest to the most populous counties and to the great cities which had heretofore had no representation in Parliament. This was a compromise measure, as was customary with the Whigs; although very different from the Radical scheme of reform, it was received with no less ridicule in the Commons. The Tories, forgetting family quarrels, came together again to oppose it, and the proposition for a second reading was passed by a majority of only one.

The ministry then dissolved the House of Commons, and at the elections of 1831 the Whig party presented itself as the Reform party, with the motto "The Bill, the whole Bill, and nothing but the Bill." For the first time since 1783 they carried a majority of seats. The second reform bill was voted by the House of Commons, but the House of Lords rejected it. This produced in all the large cities a political agitation almost revolutionary in spirit. Riots and incendiary fires were of daily occurrence.

The workingmen had adopted the policy of the Radicals in 1819, but they now allied themselves to the middle class Whigs in order to obtain a partial reform; they hoped that this partial reform would pave the way for Radical reform later. It was they who furnished the Whigs with the crowds necessary for the demonstrations, mass-meetings, and enormous processions in London and Birmingham. This popular movement gave the Whigs the force to overcome the resistance of the Lords, threatening them with a general uprising if they did not yield. A meeting at Birmingham decided even to refuse the payment of taxes if the reform bill were not passed.

After a short prorogation Parliament was convened again in December, 1831. The Commons then passed the third reform bill (March, 1832); the Lords, not daring to reject it, tried to mutilate it. The ministry then asked the King to threaten the Lords with the creation of enough new peers to change the majority. The King refused, accepted their resignation, and even tried to get Wellington to form a new ministry. But the Tories did not dare to take command. The King was obliged to recall the Whigs, promising now to create the requisite number of new

peers. The House of Lords, at Wellington's suggestion, finally yielded and passed the bill.

The reform of 1832, the result of such hard labour, was a compromise between the old system supported by the Tories, and the sweeping reform demanded by the Radicals. It preserved the organization of the old system: the House of Commons elected for a term of seven years; the right of voting considered a privilege, restricted to ancient privileged bodies (counties, boroughs, universities) and dependent on the possession or occupation of property; the old form of public, recorded vote; a plurality sufficing to elect without second elections. The number of representatives also was left unchanged (658). But it suppressed the most glaring inequality between the representation of the northwest and that of the southeast, and the most scandalous of the abuses—the rotten boroughs, the long-drawn-out polling, and the great disparity in the requirements for voting in different boroughs.

The act contained three main provisions:

First. A redistribution of seats: 143 seats were taken from boroughs; 56 boroughs under 2000 inhabitants lost all representation,* 32 others lost one of their two seats. These were redistributed to cities previously without representation and to counties; 22 cities received 2 each, 21 cities received 1 each, 65 were given to English counties, 8 to Scotland, 5 to Ireland.

Second. A more uniform and wider electoral franchise. In the counties, copyholders and leaseholders of lands worth £10 a year were admitted to vote; also tenants-at-will of lands worth £50 a year. In the boroughs householders (whether as owners or tenants) of houses worth £10 a year were allowed to vote.

Third. The voting in each constituency was to be limited to two days. Voters were no longer to travel long distances to cast their votes at the county town. A registration of voters was provided for.

The electoral body was increased in the counties from 247,000 to 370,000 electors, in the boroughs from 188,000 to 286,000. The proportion of electors to population increased from 1-32 to 1-22. The great majority of the workingmen † were still ex-

* One of these had but one member.

† The number of labouring men entitled to vote was in fact reduced by the reform. In boroughs such as Preston, where "all inhabitants" had the vote, and in the numerous boroughs where all resident householders or all "freemen" could vote, the labouring classes had a voice in the old elections.—Tr.

cluded from the right of voting, the increase was in the lower middle class, the farmers and tenants who received the county qualification, and, above all, in the industrial regions of the north, where the cities, hitherto without representation, became enfranchised boroughs. This was not a democratic reform, but it marked a determined breaking away from the old system. The House of Commons was transformed into a truly elective and representative body; maintained and controlled by public opinion, it was destined to become the political sovereign and the instrument of reform.

BIBLIOGRAPHY.

Gardiner and Mullinger's bibliography of English history, entitled "Introduction to the Study of English History," 2d edit., 1894, stops at 1822. From that point there is no single complete work. The student must ransack the bibliographies of periods: "Jahresberichte der Geschichtswissenschaft" since 1878, "English Historical Review" since 1885 (see **Langlois**, "Manuel de Bibliog. Historique," 1896), and combine the bibliographical notices of articles of the "National Biography," where the titles are usually given without dates.

SOURCES.—It would be impossible, as well as useless, to give here in detail the sources of the contemporary history of England. I confine myself to the mention of the principal classes of documents.

1. Parliamentary documents, in four classes: Public Bills; Reports of Select Committees; Reports of Royal Commissioners, Inspectors, and Others; Accounts and Papers. A catalogue of each year's documents is published annually, and a general catalogue for a series of years appears at intervals. In the Boston (Mass.) Public Library catalogue, 1861, there is a general index of the parliamentary documents to 1859; later catalogues have supplementary indices. The reports of committees and commissions are among the best sources for the study of English history. The acts of Parliament are published yearly, under the title "Public General Statutes." The public acts to 1869 are collected in 29 vols., with the title "Statutes at Large." All the more important public acts of each year are also published, with introductions and notes, in "Patterson's Practical Statutes." The debates in both Houses are published in **Hansard's Debates** and in the London *Times*. Much material of a public sort is to be found in the **State Trials**.

2. Official Publications of Public Departments.—A list of these will be found in the "Statesman's Year-book," which has appeared annually since 1864.

3. Histories of the Year.—The "Annual Register," an annual publication which dates back to the eighteenth century, gives the history of each year in detail, and an account of events of every description.

4. Reviews and Newspapers.—The political periodicals are, with the parliamentary documents, the most abundant sources of direct information

for the political history of the nineteenth century, in a country where parliamentary life and the liberty of the press have never been interrupted. On the bibliog. of English periodicals, see **Langlois**, "Manuel de Bibliog. Historique." The most important reviews for the period up to 1832 are the *Edinburgh Review* and the *Quarterly Review*. Poole's indexes to periodical literature since 1802 are invaluable.

5. Correspondence, diaries, speeches, papers, and autobiographies are the sort of collections most found in England. For this period the most important are: **Canning**: Correspondence of 1820-27, edited by E. J. Stapleton, 1887; Life, by A. G. Stapleton.—**Lord Holland**, Memoirs of the Whig Party, 1854.—**Croker**, Corresp. and Diary, 3 vols., 1884.—**Romilly**, Life, by his sons, 3 vols., 1840.—**Eldon**, Life, by Twiss, 3 vols., 1844.—**Lord Liverpool**, Life, by C. D. Yonge, 3 vols., 1868.—**Lord Colchester**, Diary and Corresp., 3 vols., 1861.—**Peel**, Life, by Parker, 2 vols., 1899.—**Lord Ellenborough**, Pol. Diary of 1828-30, 2 vols., 1881.—**Earl Grey**, Corresp. with William IV., 2 vols., 1867.—**Lord Melbourne**, Papers, edited by Sanders, 1889; Life, by Torrens, 2 vols., 1878.—**Lord Russell**, Recollections, 1875; Life, by Sp. Walpole, 2 vols., 1889.—**Lord Palmerston**, Life, to 1846 by Lord Dalling, 3 vols.; from 1846 to 1865 by E. Ashley, 2 vols; gives selections from speeches and despatches.—**Greville**, Journals, (George IV. and William IV.), 2 vols. (Victoria), 5 vols., filled with the political talk of the time in official circles.—**Grattan**, by his son, 5 vols., 1839-46; for Irish questions.—**Bamford**, "Passages in the Life of a Radical," 1844; **Horner**, edited by L. Horner, 2 vols., 1853; for the Radical agitation.

WORKS.—FOR GENERAL ENGLISH HISTORY.—**S. R. Gardiner**, "A Student's History of England," vol. iii., period 1689-1885, new edition, 1894; a very good text-book, detailed, accurate, and impartial (Green's history stops at 1815).—**Bright**, "History of England" 4 vols.

The "National Biography" (in course of publication). The biographical articles, each *signed* by the author, are able pieces of works, notable for their accuracy and the reliability of their references; some have the proportions of a monograph. See the biographies of the sovereigns, ministers, reformers, and agitators.

FOR CONTEMPORARY HISTORY.—**Martineau** (Miss Harriet), "Hist. of England," 1816-46, 2 vols., 1849, popular in England; Am. ed. (enlarged), in "4 vols.—**Walpole** (Spencer), "A Hist. of England since 1815," 6 vols., 1878-90; the most complete history, full of details on domestic conditions; the author is a Radical Liberal.—**G. C. Lewis**, "Essays on the Administrations of Great Britain from 1783 to 1830," 1864; a series of articles originally published in the *Edinburgh Review*, very valuable for the inner history of the successive ministries.

In French.—**H. Reynald**, "Hist. Contemp. de l'Angleterre," very unsatisfactory.

FOR THE ORGANIZATION AND PRACTICE OF THE GOVERNMENT.—**May** (Erskine), "Constitutional Hist. of England," 1876.—**Todd** (Alpheus), "On Parliamentary Government in England," 2 vols., 2d edit., 1887-89; excellent history of the parliamentary system.

In French.—**Fischel**, "La Constitution d'Angleterre, 1863, a good account.—**Glasson**, "Histoire du Droit et des Institutions Politiques de

l'Angleterre, vol. vi., 1883.—**Franqueville**, "*Le Gouvernement et le Parlement Britanniques*," 3 vols., 1887; by far the handiest and most complete of all; also gives the electoral reforms in detail.

FOR LOCAL ADMINISTRATION PREVIOUS TO THE REFORM.—**Gneist** (Rud.), "*Das Englische Verwaltungsrecht der Gegenwart.—Selbstverwaltung, Kommunalverfassung und Verwaltungsgerichte in England.*" The work in its first form, under a single title, appeared in 1857-60; it has been revised and published in several editions, in three parts under different titles, and the whole translated into English; one of the volumes from an old edition has been translated into French. It gives the most reliable and the most complete description of English local institutions.

FOR THE HISTORY OF LABOUR MOVEMENTS.—**Webb** (Sidney and Beatrice), "*Hist. of Trade Unionism*," 1894; followed by a detailed bibliography; one of the most instructive historical works of our time, containing an unusual quantity of fresh information, not only on the trade unions, but on the whole political activity of the workingmen.—**Von Schulze-Gaevernitz**, "*Zum Socialen Frieden*," 2 vols., 1890, gives a practical account of the history of the "political social education of the English people in the nineteenth century"; from the standpoint of the doctrine of liberal political economy.

FOR ECONOMIC TRANSFORMATION IN ENGLISH SOCIETY.—**W. Cunningham**, "*The Growth of English Industry and Commerce in Modern Times*," 1892, with a general bibliog. of economic history, the clearest and most concise general account.

ON TAXATION.—**A. Wagner**, "*Finanzwissenschaft*," 1887; gives a bibliog. and a general account.—**S. Dowell**, "*History of Taxation and Taxes in England*," 1884 (since revised).

ON IRELAND.—**de Pressensé**, "*L'Irlande et l'Angleterre*," 1889; a popular work, very partial to the Irish.—**Bryce**, "*Two Centuries of Irish History*."—**Sigerson**, "*Hist. of Irish Land Tenure*."

CHAPTER III.

ENGLAND BETWEEN THE TWO REFORMS (1832-67).*

New Conditions of Political Life.—The electoral reform of 1832 marks the end of England's old *régime*. There were no more representatives chosen by patrons. The great industrial cities entered into political life. The House of Commons became, if not much less aristocratic, at least much more representative, than before.

The change very soon made itself manifest by outward signs; increase in the number of contested elections, in the length of the sessions of the Commons, in the number of members present at a sitting, in the number of volumes of reports printed for the House (an average of 31 a year from 1824 to 1832, 50 from 1832 to 1840), in the number of petitions, which finally became so great that they had to be turned over to a Committee on Public Petitions without debate (1839).

The publication of debates increased also, though it existed only on sufferance; as late as 1832 the Commons refused to publish the votes of the representatives, and when O'Connell made them public in Ireland, his act was denounced as a violation of Parliamentary privilege. By the rules of the House, according to the mediæval principles embodied in them, the sittings and votes should be secret. But the need of publicity overcame this tradition; the Parliament building having been destroyed by fire in 1834, new halls were built with galleries for the reporters and the public. Then the House of Commons itself decided to publish division lists (1836)—that is to say, the votes of the members on both sides of contested questions.

The ancient form of procedure in the House of Commons was preserved, except the manner of voting in case of division, which was thereafter done by both sides going from the hall into the lobbies, and on the way back passing between the tellers. Practical discussion of financial matters and of details and pro-

* This chapter has been freely revised and in part rewritten.—S. M. M.

posed amendments of bills was still carried on in "committee of the whole House," with a chairman; the discussion of the general principle of bills and test votes on their enactment were reserved to the official sitting, presided over, in accordance with old custom, by the Speaker in his wig, with the mace on the table. Each representative continued to speak from his seat; each had the right to present a motion and to speak as long as he wished (the English would have no shutting off of debate.) In practice the Commons rarely passed any but the measures presented by the ministry—and this is still true at the present time.

But, while preserving its ancient forms, the House of Commons assumed a new activity. Elected by a more numerous and more independent body of voters, it inclined toward a policy of reform and real Parliamentary control. The old traditional parties dropped the names of Whig and Tory; the Whigs, uniting with the Radicals, called themselves *Liberals*; and the Tories adopted the name of *Conservatives*. The leader of the Conservatives, Sir Robert Peel, declared, in an election manifesto of 1834, that he accepted the reform as "a final and irrevocable settlement of a great constitutional question . . . which no friend to the peace and welfare of the country would attempt to disturb either by direct or by insidious means." The English Conservatives have always followed this policy, fighting a reform before it is passed, but accepting it afterward and never trying to induce a reaction to overthrow it. Before the reform the Conservatives, maintained by the gentry and the clergy, had had the upper hand. Since the reform the majority has been more often with the Liberals, maintained by the commercial classes and the Dissenters. In the 34 years from 1832 to 1866 the Liberals held power for 25 years.

The government ceased to treat the press as an enemy; the stamp duty was reduced in 1836 to 1 penny a copy, and then abolished altogether in 1855. The number of newspapers increased very little. England is still a country of few newspapers with large circulation. The number of stamps sold went up from 36,000,000 in 1836 to 53,000,000 in 1838, and 107,000,000 in 1855. Press prosecutions became rare, and the practical freedom of discussion was complete.

The Tory ministries had not greatly desired Parliamentary government; the Liberal ministries embraced it with zeal. The custom became settled that the leader of the party having a majority in the House of Commons should undertake the formation

of a ministry and that the ministry should govern without interference from the King, in accordance with the phrase now become classic: "The King reigns, but does not govern."

William IV. tried once again to make use of his prerogative to take ministers of his own choosing. The House of Commons elected in 1832 under the new electoral system, had a large but incoherent Liberal majority, the Liberal ministry under Lord Grey remaining in power. A division arose in the Cabinet on the question of the revenues of the Irish Church, and the ministry was reconstructed under Melbourne. But the King did not like the Melbourne ministry, particularly Brougham, the Lord Chancellor. Lord Althorp, the leader of the Liberal party in the House of Commons, having inherited a peerage, the King dismissed the ministry by a simple letter to Melbourne, saying that he no longer had confidence in the stability of the ministry. Peel was then asked to form a ministry, which he reluctantly consented to do. It was a minority ministry. Peel dissolved the House, but failed to obtain a majority, though he gained a number of seats. He tried to carry on the government in presence of the new Parliament; but being left four times in a minority he resigned. In doing so he declared that "according to the practice, the principle, and the letter of the Constitution, a government should not persist in directing the national affairs after a loyal attempt, contrary to the decided opinion of the House of Commons, even when it possesses the confidence of the King and a majority in the House of Lords." Thus was the principle of Parliamentary supremacy formulated by the leader of the Conservative party (1835). It has never since ceased to be regularly applied in England.

William IV. was succeeded by his niece Victoria (1837), who in her long reign has reduced her personal action to the narrowest limits, by always intrusting to the leader of the majority in the House of Commons the task of forming a ministry. The old theory of the balance of power between the three powers, King, Lords, Commons, has been replaced by the balance of power between the parties. The party having the majority of the Commons should form the ministry, because it has the confidence of the majority of the voters. When a ministry loses its majority in the House, it must resign the power to the party which has acquired that confidence. But a defeated party holds itself together in readiness to take the power again, under a chief who

is called the leader of the opposition. The two parties thus form two organizations, one in the exercise of power, the other ready to be called on at any minute. Between the two the voters hold the scales, and determine, through the House of Commons, which shall have control.*

Since 1832 the Liberals and Conservatives have alternated in control of the Commons, according to changes in public opinion. From this practice an inference has been drawn that the English Parliamentary system rests on a division of the nation into two well-defined parties, and two only, which must alternate in power. In reality the parties have never been sharply defined; the Conservatives were divided into two sets, for and against free trade, in 1846, as in 1827 they had been divided for and against Catholic Emancipation. The Liberals were divided on the army question in 1852, on the Chinese War in 1857, and on electoral reform in 1866. In all these cases the dissenting portion allied itself temporarily with the opposition, and the power was exercised by a coalition instead of a majority. Moreover, in addition to the two great parties, there were formed two new groups, the Radical party and the Irish party, which ordinarily voted with the Liberals, but remained independent of them. These members sat neither on the left nor on the right in the House; they remained on the cross benches.

Thus after the reform of 1832 was the Parliamentary system fully established—a new system, for it has had full play only since the accession of Queen Victoria. And thus was established the alternation of parties founded on the rule of the majority, but with a mechanism much less precise than classic theory assumes.

Administrative Reforms (1833-40).—The Liberal party, having succeeded to power, refused all further Parliamentary reform, and occupied itself solely with reforming the administrative organization. There were still in England, outside of the incorporated towns, only two forms of territorial division—the county and the parish. All those local affairs which spring up little by little with the growth of civilization—poor-relief, assessment of

* The following is the series of ministries under the first Reform Act: Grey, then Melbourne (Liberal) 1832-34; Peel (Conservative), 1834-35; Melbourne (Lib.), 1835-41; Peel (Cons.), 1841-46; Russell (Lib.), 1846-52; Derby (Cons.), 1852; Aberdeen (coalition, Peelites and Liberals), 1852-55; Palmerston (Liberal), 1855-58; Derby (Cons.), 1858-59; Palmerston, then Russell (Lib.), 1859-66; Derby, then Disraeli (Cons.), 1866-68.

taxes, public health, roads, and police—were given over either to the parish authorities, or, as was usually the case, to the justices of the peace, who governed rural England free from control either by the central government or by the taxpayers. The cities and the boroughs remained outside of these divisions, and constituted independent districts; but they were governed by close or self-perpetuating corporations, made up of privileged local families; even the police duties were performed by “constables,” residents of the place serving without regular pay. The Liberals denounced this system as incoherent, feeble, and arbitrary.

It was not in the nature of the English Liberals to undertake any sweeping reform; but they accomplished in a few years several partial reforms which were sufficient to transform the old administrative system. The Tories had, in 1829, created a special police service for London—that is to say, for the region lying within a certain radius from Charing Cross. It was made up of policemen, with regular pay, military organization, and discipline; but out of respect for English traditions the old name of *constable* was preserved, and they were given, in place of arms, a short club, which looked like a mere form, but could be used to break heads. Other administrative reforms now followed:

First. The Liberals, under the Grey ministry, reformed the system of poor relief. England was spending enormous sums every year for the relief of paupers; £8,600,000 in the year 1833. But the charitable intention of the nation was badly carried into practice. The administration of the poor law was nominally in the hands of the parish overseers: these were the church wardens, with two or more other persons appointed by the justices of the peace. The overseers were subject to the orders of any justice of the peace as regards the persons to receive aid and the amount of aid. The whole work of relief was managed without any intelligent system or central control to check the vagaries of local justices and overseers. Aid was given not only to the sick and aged, but also to the young and strong in the full exercise of their ordinary employment. Anybody who was refused favour by the overseers could usually find some benevolent justice ready to make the requisite order for an allowance. The justices had standards of their own for determining how much an English labourer ought to have for the support of himself and family; and if a man's wages fell below this standard, they gave an order for an allowance from the parish

rates to make up the deficiency. The larger the family the larger the allowance.

This method, instead of relieving pauperism, was really increasing it. The labourers had come to regard public alms, not as a provision for relief of misfortune, but as a right of all poor people at all times. They were taught to depend on the rates instead of depending on their own industry; they were all becoming paupers in spirit.¹ The few who struggled to maintain their self-respect were sooner or later forced to go with the crowd; for employers expected their labourers to apply for allowances, and found it easy to hire all they needed at very low wages. Wages were, in fact, declining, and allowances increasing, especially in the case of the agricultural labourers.

The burden of the poor rates fell on all income from lands and buildings (including the tithe) in each parish. So far as the land classes were concerned the system of allowances was simply a highly vicious method of supporting the farm labourers: the more they paid in allowances the less they paid in wages. So far, however, as the rates fell on the tithe of the parson or the patron, and on occupiers of houses who were not employers, the system of allowances had the very unjust effect of throwing a portion of the wages of farm hands on the shoulders of people who had nothing to do with farming.

There were cases of local irregularity and hardship for which the law afforded no remedy. Overseers had the right to prevent any labourer from settling in their parish unless he gave security against becoming a charge on the rates. This acted as a serious check on the free movement of labourers from regions where employment was scarce to regions where new industries were calling for additional labourers. Again, the overseers had the right to hand over pauper children to employers as "apprentices"—a useful provision under proper safeguards, but one that led to much cruelty because there was no care taken to protect these unfortunates against the selfish avarice of factory owners.

A commission of inquiry appointed in 1833 disclosed an appalling condition of affairs. Poor rates were so heavy that, in some parishes, they were causing farms to be abandoned, as no man could be found to till them rent-free, on condition of paying the poor rate; and yet the country seemed to be filled with cases of unrelieved misery and hardship. The dismayed Parliament decided upon a sweeping and unpopular reform. They passed the law of 1834, which established three main provisions: 1st,

¹ Read H. V. Bell's *The Servile State*, a stimulating exposition of this

it set forth the principle that no more help should be given in the paupers' own homes, except to the sick and aged; 2d, that each healthy person asking for aid should be tested by the offer of a place in the workhouse, where he would be taken care of, but obliged to work and submit to a certain discipline; 3d, that several parishes should have the right to form themselves into a union, for the purposes of the poor law; the union to have a single board of guardians and a uniform poor rate.

The new law seemed to philanthropists to be very hard on the poor, but it produced the desired effect. Many workmen, unwilling to go to the workhouse, gave up asking for help; wages rose gradually, and the burden of poor relief was lightened (four millions sterling in 1837). This was also the beginning of an administrative organization; between the county and the parish an intermediate body had arisen, with its own elected officers and its own paid employees, exercising its powers independently of the justices of the peace. This was the first break in the English system of gratuitous and aristocratic administration. Also a first step was taken toward centralization by the institution of a central board of commissioners with large powers of control over the local administration of the poor law.

Second. A similar system was created for public works; the parishes were grouped into districts empowered to build and maintain highways, with inspectors chosen by the inhabitants, under direction of a central bureau in London. They gave over some of the roads as turnpikes, to be built by private individuals, who repaid themselves by charging tolls. The railroads, however, were left to private management, the state interfering only to vote the act of expropriation for the land required.

Third. There were also unions formed for purposes of health and cleanliness, which were administered by boards of health.

Fourth. The municipalities of cities and boroughs were reformed by the Municipal Corporations Act (1835), which did away with the "close" corporations, gave to all taxpayers the right of voting for the city council, and organized all the city governments on the same model, with a mayor, aldermen, and councillors.

Fifth. The law of 1836 created an entirely new set of civil officers, the county registrars and the registrar general, whose duty was to register the facts relating to population, births, deaths, and marriages. Thus was established a regular lay system of vital statistics. The church officials continued to make

their records, but it became possible to perform a marriage without their intervention, by directly addressing the lay registrar.

Sixth. Education was entirely given up to private enterprise. The greater number of children did not go to school. It was one of the Liberal doctrines that the state should not trouble itself about education. The first departure from this principle was a grant of £20,000 to private societies for the purpose of founding schools (1833). Then Parliamentary committees were appointed to investigate the question (1834-37). Finally, in 1839, the ministry brought forward a bill for the creation of a central organ of supervision, the "Committee of the Privy Council for Education," and the appointment of some school inspectors. The Lords rejected it. It could not pass without the conditions exacted by the Anglican party, which regarded the school as an adjunct of the Church; the inspectors must be approved by the bishop, and must report to him. The school appropriation increased little by little, but very slowly (£164,000 in 1851, £800,000 in 1861).

Seventh. The reform in the penal law consisted in abolishing the pillory and the whipping-post; there was also a reform made in the prisons.

Eighth. The reform in the postal service was made in 1839. Instead of the high and variable rate of money charge, payable by the receiver to the postman who delivered the letter, the new law established the postage stamp at a fixed and moderate rate, paid by the sender (the rate was reduced in 1840 to one penny). Men who were experienced in the postal service had declared this reform impracticable, the director explaining that the carriers would no longer be able to carry all the letters and that the General Post Office would sink beneath the burden.

The result of all these reforms was to create in England an administration which, though still incomplete, was organized on new principles. The old local powers, controlled by the gentry, existed only as ornaments; the justices of the peace alone retained any real power. But in addition to these were established elective councils and paid officials of the unions which now took charge of business affairs. At their head was constituted a new power at London, the Local Government Board, the foundation of an institution which has become a sort of Ministry of the Interior. Thus the local administration of the country passed little by little out of the hands of the aristocracy into those of special bodies of elective boards and salaried officials; but these officials

were appointed by the local authorities, not, as in France, by the central government.

The Labour Agitation of the Trades Unions (1832-34).—Industrial crises, occurring from time to time, produced periods of misery and falling wages. The years preceding the reform of Parliament were a time of great suffering in the manufacturing cities, the memory of which is perpetuated in literature by Dickens' "Hard Times" and Disraeli's "Sybil," both of which set forth the misery and despair of the working people. Official investigation into the causes of the cholera epidemic, also into the condition of the women and children in the mines, disclosed the most appalling state of wretchedness and neglect of sanitary laws: people packed together in narrow quarters; in Manchester a tenth of the population living in dark and filthy cellars, the children sleeping on the damp bricks; in London families of eight persons crowded into one small room; in a parish of Dorsetshire an average of thirty-six persons to a house; wages from eight to ten shillings a week for a family, in a time when wheat was very dear; payment of workmen by the truck system, which forced them to take, in place of their wages, provisions at extortionate prices for the benefit of the employer. In the official reports of these conditions, two socialistic theorists, Marx and Engels, found many practical examples for their purposes.

The workmen had tried to better themselves by forming associations. Already they had succeeded in forming syndicates of men of the same trade to discuss the terms of labour with the employers. They wished to develop these into large associations. The idea started with a progressive philanthropist by the name of Owen, proprietor of a great cotton mill. After having transformed his own establishment into a model community, Owen began to preach co-operation, urging workmen to associate for the purpose of producing on their own account instead of producing for the profit of a capitalist.

As early as 1824 Owen had founded "co-operative societies" which, since 1829, held congresses of delegates; they had a co-operative review, and had brought into use expressions that have become a part of the workingman's vocabulary: co-operation, productive class, fair value of labour, principles of equity, and even the word *socialist*. From Owen's preaching the workmen got the impression of a common interest between all labourers and the idea that they should work together.

They tried to form associations of all the workmen in each par-

ticular trade, and a combination of all the trades. The movement, drawn aside into politics by the reform agitation in 1831, became again purely industrial in its objects. Owen had just made an attempt at conducting a bank which was to issue notes in terms of labour instead of coin. The bank had proved a failure (1832). He founded a Society for National Regeneration, to obtain a law fixing the working day at eight hours, so that workmen might have time for study (December, 1833). Then he founded the Great National Trades Union,* an association of all trades under the form of a federation of lodges, copied after the Free Masons. These lodges were associations of workmen of one trade, but organized with rites; a new member was initiated in a secret meeting presided over by the figure of Death, where he had to submit to a test with swords and axes and take an oath. This was not a new custom; the novelty lay in admitting into lodges peasants and even women. The "Trades Union" sent out missionaries and rose rapidly to a membership of half a million. The object was to organize a general strike which should force Parliament to agree to the eight-hour day.

This agitation struck terror to the hearts of manufacturers and politicians. The former retaliated by a league of employers; they bound themselves to refuse employment to any workman belonging to a union; before accepting a workman they must demand a written guarantee that he belonged to no trade union. The two parties were now pitted against each other, the workmen striking to force employers to raise wages or shorten hours, the employers trying to starve out the unions by the *lock-out*, or closing of the factories.

The government, trembling at these demonstrations, consulted an authority on political economy, Nassau Senior, who advised exceptional laws against the workingmen. The Liberal ministry was unwilling to violate "constitutional liberties"; but the King himself urged them to take action against the workingmen. Melbourne, the prime minister, announced in the name of his colleagues the view that the methods followed by the unions were criminal; they were, he declared, "illegal conspiracies," punishable in the name of the law (August, 1833). They began by prosecuting the members of trade unions for having taken oath to a society not recognised by law. The most famous of

* The Trades Union, a fabulous association of Owen's, to unite all trades, must not be confounded with the trade unions, special syndicates of each trade, which still exist.

these cases was that of six Dorsetshire labourers. They were peasants who had formed a "friendly society of farm labourers," to try and maintain a wage of ten shillings a week, the farmers having reduced it to seven; they had adopted the initiatory ceremony of a lodge belonging to the Trades Union. They were sentenced to seven years' transportation for taking illegal oaths (March, 1834), and the government ordered them shipped off without delay.*

The National Trades Union, aided by other general associations, organized an enormous meeting to send a petition to the ministry to plead for the condemned men. In a place near London the workingmen met, grouped themselves according to trades, and marched across the city, led by a Dissenting parson on horseback; the builders had stopped work (August, 1834). Then they appointed a special committee to obtain the release of the condemned men.

But these great general associations, made up mainly of the poorest labourers, weavers, spinners, miners, and journeymen, had not money enough to maintain strikes; so the strikes quickly failed for want of funds. In August, 1834, Owen transformed the Trades Union into a "British and Foreign Association of Industry, Humanity, and Learning," having reduced its aim to the humanitarian one of establishing the "new moral world," to try and reconcile the classes of society. The prosecutions went on. At Glasgow, in Scotland, five cotton spinners were condemned to seven years' transportation (1837), and the House of Commons named a committee to investigate the legality of unions. The workingmen, losing heart, gave up the great general struggle of the united labouring classes.

The Chartist Agitation (1837-48).—The Radical party, when it joined the Whigs for the demonstrations of 1831, had counted on preparing for radical reform by universal suffrage. Since 1832, it had sometimes supported, sometimes attacked, the Liberal ministry. After the accession of Queen Victoria the Radicals demanded electoral reform. Russell replied that electoral re-

* The statutes forbidding combinations of workingmen were repealed in 1824. But there was still an act in force which made it a crime to take or administer oaths not contemplated by the law. Combinations in restraint of trade were forbidden by the common law; and the projected combination of the labourers was held to be in restraint of trade. The Dorsetshire labourers were prosecuted for their breach of the statute against illegal oaths. They were pardoned at the end of two years.—Tr.

form was accomplished, and the Commons supported him, 500 to 22.

The Radicals once more began to stir up public interest for electoral reform; they arranged with workingmen excited by the great association movement of 1834. Owen's disciples had tried to obtain a social reform by private associations among workingmen; having failed, they wished to enforce reform through legislation. They must, therefore, control the majority of the House of Commons by winning over a majority of the electors. In order to do this they must obtain the suffrage for the workingmen—electoral reform being the primary condition of social reform. They therefore revived the Radical policy of 1816.

The old Radicals, who were still individualists, and the Socialistic labourers, or Owenites, came to an understanding by a conference. The movement was managed by the London Labourers' Association, a political society founded in 1837 by an Owenite workingman, Lovett, an old ally of the Radicals. They decided to adopt the Radical policy, to present to Parliament a petition for universal suffrage, and to back it up with great demonstrations. The petition, drawn up at London and published in May, 1838, consisted of six demands: universal suffrage, secret ballot, pay for representatives, abolition of the property qualification, annual elections, and, finally, division of the country into equal electoral districts, in order to insure the equal distribution of seats. This petition was known as the People's Charter. The "six points of the Charter" were simply a repetition of the demands made by the Radicals from 1816 to 1819. Chartism was a combination of the old Radical political party and the new Socialist workingman's party.

The Chartist leaders laboured to obtain as many signatures to the Charter as possible, and at the same time to stir up public feeling by great public demonstrations. The Chartist agitation lasted ten years (1838-48), with intervals of quiet. Its greatest activity coincided with the periods of industrial depression. Labourers out of work formed the great body of those making Chartist demonstrations. These took place mainly in London, and in the manufacturing regions of the west (Liverpool, Manchester, southern Wales) and in the interior (Leeds, Sheffield).

There were three great Chartist movements, marked by three huge petitions (1838-39, 1842, 1848).

First. The agitation began after the drawing up of the Charter (May, 1838). Great mass-meetings were held near Manchester,

some at night by torchlight. The principal orator, Stephens (formerly a Dissenting minister), declared as the principle of the Charter "every free man who breathes God's free air or treads God's free earth has the right to a *home*." He called on his followers to arm themselves with pikes and guns. The Tories demanded exceptional laws as in 1819, but the Liberal ministry refused, Russell declaring (October, 1838) that the people had the right of assembling and of discussion.* The speech from the throne in 1839 announced that the government discarded all repressive legislation, "trusting to the good sense and the wise disposition of the people."

The Chartists, left free to act, organized a representative congress of workingmen to direct the movement; they called it the "National Convention," also the "Workingmen's Parliament." It met in London (February, 1839) at the same time as Parliament, and gave its attention first to presenting the petition for universal suffrage. The petition was presented with 1,200,000 signatures. The members of the House of Commons were little inclined to favour its demands; they refused by a large majority, after debate, to take it into consideration.

In the "National Convention" some of the Chartist delegates disputed over the further course to be followed, and they divided into two parties. One, which refused to accept anything but pacific action by legal measures, was composed mainly of the most prosperous workingmen; those belonging to the best organized trades united in the Trade Union at London, under the leadership of Lovett, the Owenite. The other, which was called the "party of physical force," was made up of the mass of poorer labourers (weavers, spinners, etc.), led by an Irish orator, Feargus O'Connor. O'Connor, a man of gigantic height, fine presence, and powerful voice, very excitable (he died a maniac), was nephew of an Irish rebel of '98. He had been a Radical Irish member of Parliament in 1832, and in 1837 had just founded the London Democratic Association and the *Northern Star*, a paper which became the official organ of the Chartists. He announced his intention of appealing "to unshorn chins and calloused hands," and reproached Lovett and his followers with not being true workingmen.

* But the right of freely meeting for discussion gave no right to incite men to armed violence. The Liberal ministry prosecuted Stephens for his incendiary utterances, and had him sentenced to eighteen months' imprisonment.—Tr.

Actual violence was, however, confined to a few local outbreaks. At Birmingham, whither the Chartist Convention had transported itself, there was a night meeting, a riotous attack on the police, a procession, followed by the destruction of a number of houses and shops. The ministry, alarmed at this outbreak, had a law passed permitting cities to organize a regular police force like that in London; they had the Chartist leaders arrested and condemned for seditious writings and speeches. There was only one real attempt at insurrection, the attack on Newport in Wales by an armed band.

Second. In 1842 wages had been lowered and the workingmen in the north struck. The associations sent delegates to a conference to discuss means for obtaining a return to the wages of 1840. The Chartists took advantage of this to urge all labourers to cease work until the Charter should become the law of the land; the general strike, proposed in 1834 to secure a working day of eight hours, became a political agency. The strike failed for lack of funds. They then called for signatures to a new petition, and presented it with, it is said, more than 3,000,000 names attached. The government refused to receive it. The Radical workingmen tried to come to an agreement with the middle-class Radicals in a conference at Birmingham. The middle-class Radicals proposed to replace the "People's Charter" with a "Bill of Popular Rights." O'Connor prevented the agreement.

The Trade Unions then broke away from the Chartist movement and, renouncing boisterous agitation and intimidation, tried to improve the condition of the workingmen by coming to an understanding with the employers and demanding labour reforms from Parliament. A "National Association of Trades united for the Protection of Labour" was formed which recommended conciliation by arbitration and the use of influence with members of Parliament. This was the new peaceable policy which was to take the place of the Chartist agitation.

The Chartists remaining in the movement followed O'Connor. Returning to an old idea of Owen's to support labourers out of work by distributing land to them, he created a society for the purpose of buying up large estates, and dividing them up into small farms to be given out by lot to his followers (1846). This "National Land Company" ended in 1848 in bankruptcy.

Third. The Revolution of 1848 in France aroused the Chartists to their last effort. Once more they held a convention at Lon-

don (April, 1848); once more they prepared an enormous petition. O'Connor announced a mass-meeting and a great procession to carry the petition to Parliament. The ministry became alarmed and declared it illegal to hold a meeting to escort a petition "accompanied by an excessive number of persons"; they called on Wellington and intrusted to him the peace of London. The old general stationed troops in the city as if for battle, and enrolled the middle class of London as special constables, to the number of 170,000. The meeting was held, but they stopped the procession, and O'Connor alone carried the petition to Parliament in a hackney coach. The petition was examined by a special committee; instead of the 5,716,000 signatures announced by O'Connor, they found only 1,975,000, and some of those spurious (the Queen, Wellington, Pug Nose). This was the end of the Chartist agitation.

The Irish Agitation.—While the Chartists were stirring up England, the Catholics were stirring up Ireland. A powerful orator, O'Connell, whose fame had spread all over Europe, had just organized into a party the great Catholic mass of the Irish population. To tell the truth, he was not simply the leader of a party, he was the life and soul of it. The Irish, unaccustomed to public affairs, had no political life; they obeyed their priests, voted for the candidates of the clergy, and came in a body to the meetings organized by O'Connell, where they went wild over the enthusiastic discourses of their leader.

O'Connell declared that he belonged to the Liberal Catholic party, which had just been formed in Europe; he demanded for the Catholic Church only liberty and equality with the other churches, he did not care to have it an established church. He thus spoke at once in the name of liberty and equality, in the name of the Catholic religion, in the name of the oppressed Irish nation; and this attracted to him the sympathies of revolutionists, Catholics, and patriots, which made him the most popular man in all Europe. Since the reform of 1829 the Irish Catholics had had the political rights of voting and sitting in Parliament, but they remained subject to all the old systematically organized dependence on the Protestants; justices of the peace, police officials, criminal juries, justices of the Supreme Court, grand juries charged with the power of taxation, municipal corporations, all the men invested with authority, were Protestants. The official church was the Anglican Church; in some parts of Ireland it had almost no members, but it possessed estates and in addition re-

ceived tithes and a church "cess" for the support of places of worship, from all the inhabitants, that is to say, from Catholic as well as Protestant peasants. Finally the government deprived the Irish Catholics of the liberty of holding meetings.

O'Connell seems to have hesitated between two tactics; now he demanded from the English Parliament reforms in detail—liberty of holding meetings, a more equal distribution of power between the Catholics and Protestants, and above all the abolition of tithes. By agitating for repeal of the Act of Union, he tried to get restored to Ireland the self-government which she had enjoyed before the Union. In 1831 he formed a committee to obtain signatures to a petition against the Union, but the government prosecuted him. As early as 1832 he had founded an association to demand autonomy, but it was thrice dissolved. But in the Parliament elected after the Reform Act of 1832, O'Connell ceased to fight the English government, and supported the Liberal ministry, profiting by the meetings of the House of Commons to air the grievances of the Irish against the English supremacy.

The Irish refused any longer to pay tithes to the Anglican clergy. Some of the collectors were murdered; of 104,000 pounds sterling, only 12,000 were paid in. The ministry made a partial reform, suppressing 12 of the 22 Anglican bishops, and abolishing the tax for the support of the Church buildings. But it was divided on the question of the Irish Church. The better to oppose the Conservatives, the Irish party, nicknamed "O'Connell's tail," joined the Liberals and secured to them a majority in the House (1835). It was natural that the ministry should do something in return for their support.

In every session from 1832 to 1838 the Liberal ministers had measures before Parliament for the settlement of the difficulties growing out of the general revolt of the Irish farmers against the payment of tithes. They found it impossible to propose anything that would at once satisfy the Irish Catholics, who demanded the total abolition of tithes, and the English champions of the Protestant Establishment, who demanded that the revenues of the Church of Ireland should not be reduced. The English parties agreed as early as 1836 that the tithe should be converted into a rent-charge, to be paid by the landlords. But they could not agree as to the disposal of the surplus revenue arising from the abolition of various offices and livings in the Irish Church. The ministers carried through the Commons each year a bill converting the tithe into a rent-charge and appropriating the sur-

plus to educational and charitable uses; the bill was regularly defeated in the Lords. It was eventually passed in 1838 in the form desired by the Tories—that is, without the appropriation clause. In the same year a poor law was passed for Ireland. Two years later an act was passed reforming the municipal corporations in Ireland—a less liberal measure, however, than the English act of 1835, in that it gave the right of voting at municipal elections, not to all rate-payers, but only to the £10-householders.

But the Liberal ministry had little by little lost its popularity in England, perhaps because of its reforms, perhaps because of internal divisions, and also because it was upheld by “the Irish Papists.” In the elections of 1837 it still had a majority, but owed it to the members from Scotland and Ireland, the Conservatives having once more carried England. Its Radical supporters were offended at several of its measures, particularly one dealing with Jamaica. In 1839 the ministry had to confess to a continued deficit. After a vote in which it had a majority of only 5, it felt itself so weak that it resigned. The leader of the Conservatives, Peel, charged with the formation of a ministry, could not agree with the Queen as to the retirement of certain ladies-in-waiting who were wives or sisters of Liberal ministers. Peel abandoned the attempt to form a ministry, and the Liberal ministry resumed control. But the deficit increased to two millions sterling in 1841. The ministry, to remedy this, proposed to lower the import duties on sugar and timber, and to adopt a fixed duty of a shilling a bushel on wheat, instead of the sliding scale. Their measures were condemned by a majority of 36. They dissolved the House, and for the first time since the Reform Bill there was returned a Conservative majority. The Irish party in the House was reduced one-half. The government was intrusted to a Conservative ministry, under Peel.

O’Connell began once more to call for radical reform. He reconstructed the league for repeal of the Union, and, adopting the Chartist policy, he organized the agitation on a grand scale. He started a newspaper, and held great mass-meetings to demand home rule for Ireland.

Like the Chartists, the Irish, in demanding political reform, were seeking social reform. The population increased rapidly (from 6,800,000 in 1826 to 7,760,000 in 1836 and 8,670,000 in 1841), the land being divided up more and more. Official inquiry in 1835 reported the sufferings of the agricultural popula-

on as beyond description. The peasants almost invariably lived in squalor in little windowless mud cabins, often under the same roof with their pigs and cows, having no clothing but rags, and no food but potatoes. In addition to all this they were still dependent upon the caprice of the landlord, who could turn them out at will without compensation. The Irish desired first of all a guarantee against this arbitrary power; they demanded fixed tenure—that is to say, the right of the peasant to the land.

The year 1843 was one of great agitation. O'Connell said that the Queen had the right to convoke a Parliament for Ireland and prophesied that such a Parliament would meet within the year. Within three months thirty mass-meetings were held in Ireland; that at Tara, where 250,000 men assembled, voted the re-establishment of the Irish Parliament. O'Connell declared that he would conquer "by legal, peaceful, constitutional means and through the electrical power of public opinion."

He called together a mass-meeting at Clontarf near Dublin. But the government had just passed a law which forbade unauthorized possession of firearms in Ireland; it forbade this meeting and sent troops to prevent it. O'Connell, wishing to do nothing illegal, implored his constituents to disperse. He was nevertheless arrested, tried, and condemned, by a jury wholly Protestant, for plotting and inciting hatred and contempt against the government. The sentence was set aside by the House of Lords by reason of irregularity of procedure; and O'Connell, set at liberty, was received in triumph by the crowd. But his health was broken and he retired from the contest. Like the peaceable agitation of the Chartists, that of the Irish was powerless against the English confidence in the advantages of the Union. By means of prohibition, employment of troops, and prosecutions, all agitations were put down.

The Free-Trade Agitation.—At the same time that the Chartists were working for universal suffrage and the Irish for home rule, a free-trade party was working to obtain another sweeping reform, the destruction of the ancient protective system. The party was organized first to procure the abolition of the import duties on grain, and was known as the Anti-Corn-Law League. The two Protestant aristocracies which together controlled England joined forces against the Irish agitation for repeal of the Union; but on the question of the Corn Laws the interests of the two were in competition. The landed aristocracy wished to preserve the duties which kept wheat at a high price and conse-

quently kept rents high; the manufacturing aristocracy wished to lower the price of bread, so as to be able to lower the wages of the workmen.

The free trade party was made up chiefly among the middle-class manufacturers and merchants; it had its centre at Manchester, where they had built the Free Trade Hall, as a home for the Free Trade Club. The early leader was Villiers, a member of Parliament; but the movement was presently taken in charge by Richard Cobden, a cotton merchant, who gave his life to the cause, and John Bright, a Radical orator. These three began by urging the repeal of the Corn Laws in Parliament, but the Commons steadily rejected the measure by heavy majorities. The party then adopted the policy of the Radicals, agitation by public meetings and speeches. Cobden and Bright travelled all over England holding meetings; they showed how the duties on wheat benefited the landlords alone and injured all other classes; the workmen by keeping up the price of their food, the manufacturers and merchants by preventing foreign countries from selling their wheat to the English and buying in return the products of English industry.

The league converted the manufacturers and was also supported by the labourers, who were working at once for the Charter and against the Corn Laws. The Liberal ministry proposed a slight reform, to establish a fixed rate of a shilling a bushel, and was defeated (1841). The Conservative ministry (Peel) which succeeded, depended on a majority of landowners hostile to the reform. But Peel was not an absolute Conservative; as in 1829, at the time of the Catholic Emancipation, he tried to face actual conditions, and to do what seemed best for the country at large. He began by restoring equilibrium in the budget by re-establishing the income tax abolished in 1816, on all incomes exceeding £150. Although established provisionally, this duty has been preserved and has become one of the foundations of English finance. Peel also carried a lessening of the duties on wheat against the wish of a fraction of his party. The equilibrium of the budget was not only restored, there was a surplus instead of a deficit. Peel took advantage of this to carry another reform in the direction of free trade, abolishing what remained of the export duties and lowering the import duties, in spite of the misgivings of his own party.

Peel, in maintaining the grain duties, hoped to keep up a sufficient home production to guard England against famine in

case of war. The famine of 1845 showed him that the population had become too large to be able to live on native products alone. The potato blight suddenly deprived the Irish of their ordinary food, and there ensued a famine in Ireland, thousands of people dying of starvation. Peel, in order to save the Irish, decided to demand the abolition of the wheat duties; but as some of his fellow ministers would only agree to a suspension of them, he thought it best to resign. But the Liberals could not form a ministry, so Peel resumed power and succeeded in carrying the repeal of the Corn Laws, against the majority of his own party, by the aid of the Liberal minority. The bill was passed by 223 Liberals and 104 Conservatives against 229 Conservatives. Wellington induced the Lords to accept it (1846).

The Chartist and Irish agitations had been directed against both of the controlling classes; free trade in wheat was imposed on the landed aristocracy by the industrial middle class.

Industrial Legislation.—While the workingmen were struggling to obtain radical reform, a number of philanthropists were trying by means of small reforms to improve the condition of workmen in the large factories. These men were not Radicals, some of the most active leaders were Conservatives (Ashley); others were writers and preachers (Kingsley, Denison) who were moved by the sufferings of the poor. They demanded, in the name of humanity and Christian charity, that laws should be passed to protect workmen against the neglect and avarice of their employers. They had great trouble in convincing Parliament of the need of these laws; all liberal schools of political economy of the time taught that the state should leave employers and workmen to settle between themselves the conditions of labour, and never interfere. All industrial legislation seemed a violation of the "freedom of contract."

The reformers began with the workers who were at once the most wretched and the least capable of defending themselves, the children. As early as 1802 an epidemic at Manchester had obliged Parliament to interfere for the protection of the "parish apprentices," that is to say, the children of paupers; the parish hired them out to manufacturers, who made them work night and day in the cotton mills, as soon as they were seven years of age. The law of 1802 forbade working them more than 12 hours a day, and made other provisions for their protection. But this law was limited to the "apprentices." In 1819 an act was passed extending the provisions of 1802 to all children employed in the cotton

factories, with the addition that no children under the age of nine should be so employed.

In 1831 it was decided to create a commission of inquiry to study the question. The inquiry revealed a state of affairs so lamentable that the Tory philanthropist Ashley procured the passage of the Factory Act of 1833. This act extended the protective provision to *all children* working in factories of any sort. It fixed a maximum working day of 9 hours for children under 13 years, a maximum of 12 hours for young persons from 13 to 18 years of age; it forbade night work. To oversee the execution of this law factory inspectors were appointed.

The reform went on slowly, by little measures successively wrung from the members of Parliament. The Conservative party helped to pass them, through opposition to the manufacturers of the Liberal party.

A law was passed forbidding the truck system or payment of wages in kind (the employer had a shop, where he expected his workmen to get their supplies, deducting from their wages the price of the articles bought).

Another law forbade the employment of children as chimney sweeps.

The great reform was the Labour in Mines Act of 1842, passed under the influence of a pitiful report by an investigating commission. It was discovered that children five years old were made to work twelve hours a day in mines ill supplied with air and full of water, in company with ruffians who ill-treated them; that hardly a twentieth of these boys could read; that little girls were harnessed to small wagons of coal and required to pull them through passages that were not high enough to stand up in. Parliament passed a sweeping reform, forbidding all underground work for women and for children under 10 years of age; also providing for the appointment of inspectors of mines.

The Factory Act of 1844 forbade the employment of children under 9 in textile industries, lowered the maximum hours of labour for children to $6\frac{1}{2}$ daily, and ordered them sent to school for a part of each day. A few years later a law was passed fixing $10\frac{1}{2}$ hours as the maximum day for women and young persons employed in factories.

Industrial legislation extended gradually to almost all industries, until the act of 1878 consolidated all the partial measures into a sort of code. These laws protected only women and children, grown men being considered capable of protecting them-

selves. In reality, however, in those mills which employed both men and women, the hours of labour were limited by the legal maximum for women and the men profited by it.

The Irish Crisis (1845-48.)—When the English government had put an end to the Irish agitation for home rule, the great mass of the national party, influenced by O'Connell and the Catholic priests, resigned themselves to a peaceful attitude. But the more ardent young men detached themselves and formed the *Young Ireland* party, which broke with O'Connell. It was a lay party, democratic and revolutionary, which was unwilling to obey the clergy and talked of establishing Irish independence by force of arms.

Peel tried to make a reconciliation with the peaceable wing of the Irish. In order to win over the priests, he increased from £9000 to £26,000 the annual grant to the Maynooth Colleges, the Irish theological seminaries; this in spite of a furious outcry on the part of ultra Protestants (1845). To win over the peasantry, he appointed a commission of inquiry to study means for improving the condition of the tenantry. He then proposed to extend to all Ireland some features of the tenant-right prevailing in Ulster; but the House of Lords rejected the plan (1845) and the reform scheme fell through. Peel tried to soothe the hatred between the Protestants and Catholics by creating in the south, west, and north of Ireland three neutral colleges to be affiliated with Dublin University; but the Irish clergy condemned the scheme, and Catholic youth have not attended in great numbers. Then came the failure of the potato crop (1845) and the great famine of 1846. The starving peasants swarmed into the cities to pick up scraps of victuals; they ate herbs and lichens; the roads were strewn with corpses. The surplus population perished from hunger or emigrated to America; at a rough estimate the population of Ireland dropped from 8,170,000 in 1845 to 6,500,000 in 1851, and since that time it has been steadily decreasing (5,100,000 in 1881, 4,700,000 in 1891).

To curb the revolutionary spirits, Peel proposed a bill regulating the possession of arms in Ireland. The Conservative protectionists seized the chance to avenge themselves for the abolition of the Corn Laws; they voted with the Liberal minority. Peel, defeated, handed in his resignation. The Russell ministry, supported by a coalition of Liberals and Peelites, continued Peel's policy.

The ministry proposed to protect the Irish tenant against the

power of the landlord and to permit the sale of portions of those entailed estates which were burdened with too heavy mortgages (more than half the income of Irish estates was absorbed by mortgages). They hoped by getting portions of these sold to solvent buyers to replace the debt-laden landlords with prosperous men who could apply capital to improve the wretched farming prevalent in Ireland. But Parliament rejected the portion of the plan especially designed for the tenantry, and passed only the bill relating to encumbered estates (1849). In later years the new landlords purchasing under the encumbered estates act proved to be more ready to evict the peasants than the old landlords had been. The peasants on their side have been but too ready to avenge evictions by outrages and murder.

All at once the revolutions of '48 aroused Young Ireland; clubs were formed, an address was sent to the provisional government of France to ask for its aid. The English government had exceptional laws passed and arrested 118 leaders of the party. An armed band attempted an outbreak; it was surrounded and captured by the police in a potato field. The leaders were transported (1848). Political agitation came to an end in Ireland.

Period of Inaction and Democratic Evolution (1849-65).—The Conservative party, divided on the Corn Laws, remained long in a weak state. The bulk of the protectionist party pulled itself together again slowly under the leadership of Bentinck, who died in 1848, and later under Derby and Disraeli; the dissidents who had followed Peel in his conversion to free trade (the Peelites) made for a time a sort of third party. The Liberal party, in minority since 1841, regained a majority through a dissolution of the House (1847) and kept it until the election of 1874; it gradually absorbed most of the Peelites, giving them place in every Liberal ministry; one of these, Gladstone, ended by becoming leader of the Liberal party.

Although the Liberals held the majority all the time, the ministry changed several times, once owing to rivalry between the two Liberal leaders, Russell and Palmerston. The Conservatives were twice enabled to take command for a period of several months (1852, 1858-59).

This was a period of political inaction. The Liberals had exhausted their reform program.* They completed the estab-

* The Ecclesiastical Titles bill was passed (1851) to soothe the Protestants. It forbade the assumption of titles taken from English cities by Catholic bishops. It never was enforced, and was repealed in 1871.

lishment of free trade by repealing the Navigation Act (1849), by abolishing most of the remaining duties, and by concluding with France the treaty of commerce of 1860. They timidly increased the appropriation for schools (164,000 pounds sterling in 1851, 813,000 in 1861) and made the appropriation proportionate to the number of scholars (1853).

Public life was dominated at that time by questions of foreign policy. Napoleon's *coup d'état* forced the retirement of Palmerston, who had approved it; the Crimean War restored Palmerston to power (1855); the Sepoy Rebellion (1857) led to the suppression of the India Company; the Chinese War, discountenanced by the House of Commons, led to a dissolution which gave Palmerston a majority (1857); the Orsini conspiracy (1858) brought about his fall. Finally, after a short Conservative ministry, Palmerston was restored to office in 1859 and retained the position until his death in 1865.

This was a period of material prosperity. England's commerce, her production, her wealth, all increased rapidly. The number of paupers decreased from 1,429,000 in 1842 (maximum) to 890,000 in 1861; the number of criminals from 31,000 in 1842 (maximum) to 18,000 in 1861; drunkenness diminished, the government having raised the duty on spirits from 2 to 16 shillings and lowered the duty on tea from 26 to 6 pence.

The condition of the workingmen improved. It was during this period that the trades unions gradually built up the central organization which was destined later to bind the workingmen into common action. It was established without a prearranged plan for practical reasons. Each trade union was at first only an association of men working at the same trade in the same city, a simple society for mutual support, with a fund, made up by regular contributions, for giving aid in case of funerals, sickness, destitution, or change of residence. The society elected a board which represented it in discussing collective interests with the employers. Many unions had a special fund for help in case of a strike, but it was made up of special contributions.

Between the unions of different trades in the same town, and between the unions of the same trade in different towns, there naturally sprang up federations, to receive workmen moving from one place to another and to harmonize common decisions among all the workmen of the same region. Each of these federations had also a board, made up of elected delegates. Finally general associations were formed of all the unions of the

same trade in all parts of England, of Scotland, or of all Great Britain. A general congress of delegates was convoked when there were special questions to be decided; but ordinary affairs, especially matters of finance, which had become very complicated, could no longer be left to the zeal of ordinary members who gave up their evenings to writing. There were now salaried secretaries, workmen elected by their comrades, who gave up their trade to serve the union exclusively. Thus was formed an official "general staff" of workmen, who made a business of defending their class interests.

The united movement of English workmen, interrupted in 1843, began again, but this time under their own leaders and with a definite object. The general secretaries of the principal associations—mechanics, carpenters, masons—meeting in London became accustomed to working in concert. They then succeeded in founding a common organ for the trade unions, the Council of the Unions. Officially this organization had no political motive, its purpose being to discuss with employers the terms of labour contracts. Unlike the Chartists, the leaders of the movement rejected all thought of a political program. They had adopted the liberal doctrine of the English middle classes, which deprecated state interference in labour contracts. They relied on the power given by association as of sufficient strength to oppose the employers. But they were handicapped by the laws restraining the right of striking; to get rid of these laws they must work through members of Parliament. They therefore perceived the necessity of establishing a voting force, and, abandoning the principle of political neutrality, they joined the Radicals in the demand for the extension of the suffrage to workmen.

The Electoral Reform of 1867.—The reform question came up after the death of Palmerston in 1865. Two projects of electoral reform, one proposed by the Conservative ministry (1859), the other by the Liberal ministry (1860), had been rejected by the Commons. The new Liberal ministry (Russell-Gladstone) brought forward a scheme (1866) to lower the franchise by reducing the value of lands and houses qualifying for the privilege of voting; but a fraction of the Liberal party, nicknamed the Adullamites,* joined themselves to the Conservatives to carry an amendment cutting down the proposed extension of the voting

* So nicknamed by John Bright, the allusion being to the Bible story which tells how all who were discontented gathered themselves in the Cave of Adullam.—1 Samuel. xxii. 2.

right. The ministry retired (1866) and was succeeded by a Conservative ministry under Lord Derby.

The Conservatives were in a minority. The ministry depended for its support on the coalition of Conservatives and Adullamites, who opposed electoral reform. Then the workingmen took the matter up. Reviving the Radical policy of 1831, they organized mass-meetings. The movement was directed by the "National Reform League," whose council was made up in part of the official leaders of the workingmen, the secretaries of the trade unions. The meeting at Trafalgar Square in London made a strong declaration in favour of reform. Another meeting was called at Hyde Park, but the government had the park closed; the mob, in spite of the police, smashed the railings and invaded the park. The government withdrew the police. Then, until the end of 1866, meetings were held in all the great industrial cities of the northwest and Scotland, demanding universal suffrage.

The Conservative ministry at first declined to present a specific project of reform; they asked the House of Commons to develop a series of resolutions embodying the wishes of the members regardless of party lines. The Liberals declined to accept this proposal. Disraeli, who had long favoured a wide suffrage, then prevailed on his colleagues to submit a definite scheme as a Cabinet measure. The decision was not, however, unanimous; three dissatisfied ministers retired. The project, strongly amended in the Commons, became the reform act of 1867 (1868 for Scotland and Ireland).

As in 1832 this was only a partial reform consisting of two measures; a redistribution of seats, and a lowering of the franchise. The redistribution took away 58 seats from the smaller boroughs; 11 were deprived of all representation, 35 were reduced to 1 member each. Of the seats thus gained 19 were given to English urban constituencies, 9 to Scotland, and 30 to the counties. The franchise or voting qualification was granted in counties to occupying tenants-at-will of property worth £12 a year (previously £50). The £10 freehold, leasehold, and copyhold qualification was reduced to £5. In boroughs votes were given to all householders (previously the house had to be worth £10 a year), also to lodgers in tenements whose lodgings were worth £10 a year unfurnished. The latter provision was designed to admit all the better class of town labourers to the elective franchise.

The reform did not do away with the unequal representation

in the counties; it was estimated that 125 members represented 12,500,000 persons, while 158 members represented 7,500,000. The boroughs with a population under 50,000 had 230 deputies for 3,280,000 persons, those with a population above 50,000 having 130 deputies for 11,537,000 persons. The reform preserved the character of privilege in the right of voting. It demanded further one year's residence before a man had the right to inscribe himself as a voter. But it doubled the voting body in the English counties and boroughs, and trebled it in the Scottish boroughs. In the cities the increase was especially great. In short, the reform enfranchised nearly all the workingmen of the cities, and England entered upon the democratic era.

BIBLIOGRAPHY.

BIBLIOGRAPHY AND SOURCES.—See bibliography under chap. ii. The documents are of the same nature as for the preceding period. The reviews are becoming more numerous and more important; in addition to those already given, the *Westminster Review*, the *Saturday Review*, and the *Fortnightly Review*.

Under the head of correspondence, memoirs, and speeches, in addition to the documents common to the two periods indicated under the preceding chapter (**Peel, Russell, Palmerston, Greville, Croker**) the most important are: **Malmesbury**, "Memoirs of an Ex-Minister," 2 vols. 1884; **Iddesleigh** (Stafford Northcote), *Life*, by Lang, 2 vols., 1890; **Prince Consort**, *Life*, by Martin, 5 vols., 1880, has much original material for political history; **O'Connell, T. Davis**, 1890, both on the Irish agitation; **Gammage**, "Hist. of Chartism," 1854, on the Chartist agitation.

WORKS.—ON THE GENERAL HISTORY.—See chap. ii.

In addition to **Gardiner, Martineau, Walpole**, and the "National Biography," mentioned under chap. ii., there is a general history of England from 1830 to 1871, 3 vols., by **Molesworth**; also a history since Victoria's accession: by **Justin McCarthy**, "Hist. of Our Own Times," 5 vols., extending to 1897. The series entitled, "Prime Ministers of Queen Victoria," 1890-91, is a collection of biographies of the ministers, **Peel, Aberdeen, Palmerston, Gladstone Beaconsfield, and Salisbury**, by different authors.

ON CENTRAL GOVERNMENT AND LOCAL ADMINISTRATION.—See bibliography under chap. ii.

The chief works are: **Todd, Gneist**, and, in French, **Franqueville**.—**Cox**, "Institutions of the English government," 1863, an excellent account for that date.

ON THE LABOUR AND CHARTIST AGITATION.—In addition to **S. Webb**, see articles and bibliog. in the "National Biography," on "Owen" and the Chartist leaders (**Lovett, O'Connor, O'Brien, Jones, Frost**). There is as yet no complete history of the Chartist movement; **Graham Wallace** is preparing one.

ON THE IRISH AGITATION.—In addition to *Pressensé*, see the "National Biography," bibliog. under the article "O'Connell."

ON THE FREE-TRADE AGITATION.—*J. Morley*, "Life of Cobden," 2 vols.; *Villiers*, Free-Trade Speeches, 2 vols., 1883; *Bright*, Letters, edited by *Leech*, 2 vols., Life, by *Robertson*, 1881; *L. Brentano*, "Anfang und Ende der Englischen Kornzölle," 1892; *Richelot*, "Histoire de la Réforme Commerciale en Angleterre," 2 vols., 1853-55, a book for popular use.

ON INTERNAL DEVELOPMENT.—A collection entitled "The Reign of Queen Victoria, a survey of fifty years of prosperity," 6 vols., 1888; each author has treated one subject: *Huxley*, the natural sciences; *Hatch*, religion; *Courtney*, finance; *Garnett*, literature; *Caird*, agriculture, and *Matthew*, education.

ON DESTITUTION IN ENGLAND.—*Karl Marx*, "Das Kapital," vol. ii., 1885; *Engels*, "Die Lage der Arbeitenden Classen in England," 1845; both socialists.

CHAPTER IV.

ENGLAND AS A DEMOCRACY.*

Conditions of Political Life.—The electoral reform of 1867, by transforming the voting body, changed the conditions of political life in England. Voters became much more numerous; elections were more generally contested; in the cities and boroughs the workingmen gained the political control. Almost everywhere since 1867 the voters have formed a popular mass too numerous to be bought, or controlled by a great lord.

The parties have been obliged to adapt themselves to this democratic transformation; they have adopted the custom originated in the United States of organizing a permanent association to disseminate the party principles and direct party operations in time of election. The Liberals set the example by founding a league with its centre at Birmingham, and the Conservatives have copied them. There existed already an organization of the parties in Parliament, each having its recognised leader and its whippers-in charged with bringing out the full strength of the party for important votes. Parliament has preserved its ancient custom of having no pay for members, and of voting openly by division. Those members who have private business to carry on are often absent from London; they must be summoned when their vote is needed.

Each party has founded a correspondence bureau, to keep in touch with its voters, with a permanent central committee and local committees; as in the United States, election programs have become party manifestos, and an attempt is made to sum up each party's policy in a short and striking formula to serve as the battle-cry for its adherents.

Representatives have become more dependent on the voters, the House of Commons having become more representative. Parliamentary rule has become more systematic; the House of Commons is the sovereign power, no ministry daring to govern without the support of its majority.

* This chapter has been freely revised and in part rewritten.—S. M. M.

The parties have held their ground in their old strongholds. The Conservative party still depends chiefly on the voters of the English counties, that is to say, on the territory still controlled by the Church and the landed gentry. The Liberals have the voters of the boroughs and cities, chiefly in the manufacturing regions of the north and west of England, the English Dissenters opposed to the Anglican clergy, and the greater part of Scotland, a democratic country; its electoral forces have increased. But the House of Commons itself has been transformed. The old aristocratic Whigs, hostile to the workingmen, have gradually disappeared; a new generation of middle-class Radicals has appeared, elected by the working classes, with a democratic policy. The English system of election by plurality vote, without second ballots, compels the opponents of the Conservatives to combine their votes on a single candidate. It thus prevents the formation of a distinct Radical party. The Liberal party has become a permanent coalition of old Liberals and Radicals which little by little has come to adopt the Radical program. The Liberal leader Gladstone, who began his career as a Peelite Conservative, has been won over by a continuous evolution to the Radical standard. The Conservatives have maintained their policy of steadily opposing all new reforms, though never attempting to undo those already established. But it has also taken on a more democratic appearance.*

Gladstone's Reforms (1868-74).—The Conservative ministry of which Disraeli had become head (February, 1868) by the retirement of Derby, maintained itself without a majority until the end of 1868. They put off the election of a new Parliament until the new lists of voters should be ready, in accordance with the Act of 1867.

The elections held after the system had been reformed returned a heavy Liberal majority (387 against 271), given by the boroughs and by Scotland. The Adullamites, or aristocratic Whigs, had disappeared; the Liberals, elected by a coalition of Liberal and Radical voters, entered on a reform program which had been explained to the voters. There were two leading reform

*The statements of this paragraph were approximately true in 1870, but they are not borne out by recent general elections. The cities are chiefly represented by Tories. Nor is it true that the new Tories "steadily oppose all new reforms"; they oppose some proposed by the Radicals, but many of the liberal reforms of the last twenty-five years have been enacted by the Tories.—TR.

projects. Gladstone, a Liberal-Conservative, leader of the Liberal-Radical coalition, had spoken above all of reform for Ireland. Bright, leader of the Radicals, stood for free elementary education, land reform to give peasants bits of ground, abolition of duties on tea and sugar to give workingmen "a free breakfast table," and a cut in the expenses of the army and navy.

As after 1832, the electoral reform stimulated Parliamentary activity, and the Liberal majority undertook a series of reforms to satisfy its Irish and Radical allies.

Gladstone began with Ireland. After the famine and emigration of 1848, the Irish had passed through a long period of depression without political excitement. Then a new national party was organized with the aid of the Irish established in the United States. It took the form of a secret society, with an initiatory oath, night meetings, and a symbolic standard, and gave to itself the name of *Fenians* (a name taken from the legendary history of Ireland). It was a revolutionary republican party, wishing to establish the Republic of Ireland by an armed revolt against England; it counted on the Irish-Americans who had just served in the two armies during the Civil War; it hoped also to attract the Irish soldiers who were so numerous in the English army. The Irish people secretly encouraged the movement (there were even, in 1861, great demonstrations in honour of the national martyrs).

The government had seized the secret printing-press of the Fenian newspaper, arrested and condemned the leaders of the party (1865). But the party had reorganized itself. The Fenians remaining in the United States had tried to invade Canada. Those who had come from America, officers and soldiers of the American army, had prepared for a general uprising in Ireland (March, 1867); this was a failure. The Fenians tried to agitate in England also; one of them, Kelly, an American general, plotted to seize the arms in the Chester arsenal, but he was caught and taken away; a band of Fenians attacked the carriage in which he was being carried away and freed him; three of these men were executed and were celebrated by the Irish as martyrs. Another Fenian general was confined in a prison in London; an attempt was made to blow up the prison (1867).

These two incidents attracted the attention of the English. Gladstone declared that reforms had become necessary in Ireland. Like Peel in 1845, he proposed not to satisfy the revolutionists by granting home rule, but to appease the mass of the

population, the clergy, and the peasants. It was necessary, he said, to make law as much respected in Ireland as in England, and, in order to make it respected, they must first convince the people that law is a friend, not an enemy. Following this principle, the ministry carried two reforms:

First. They disestablished and disendowed the Anglican Church in Ireland. They disendowed it by taking from it its tithes and estates, the whole valued at sixteen million pounds sterling. The proceeds were divided into three parts: the largest went as compensation to the rectors and others having "vested interests" in the Church, which was to become an unofficial corporation; the second part went to assist the two other Irish churches, the Presbyterian and the Catholic, and the third to be a fund for the establishment of charitable institutions (hospitals and asylums).^{*} This was not a radical measure, for the Anglican Church of Ireland retained its buildings and was still very rich; but the reform put an end to the official inequality between the churches, so offensive to the majority (1869-71).

Second. To better the condition of the peasants the ministry passed the Land Act of 1870. This gave the force of law to the custom of the Protestant province of Ulster, where the landlord was under obligation, by force of custom, not to raise the rent arbitrarily, nor to evict the tenant without paying him a compensation to reimburse him for all improvements made in the land. A similar right to compensation for eviction was extended to the rest of Ireland. But the measure had little effect, as no protection was given against eviction for non-payment of rent—and such evictions became unhappily frequent in the years following the passage of the act.

At the same time, to oppose the revolutionists, the government passed a Coercion Act, instituting special measures for the suppression of crime in Ireland.

In England the Liberal ministry, to satisfy the Radicals, carried a reform in primary education. The old Liberals had contented themselves with an appropriation for private schools; the Act of 1870 made primary instruction obligatory. In all

^{*} The amount given to the Catholics and Presbyterians (£1,120,000) was fourteen times the annual grants they had been receiving under the name of the Maynooth Grant and the *Regium Donum*. These annual grants were then discontinued. The third part, known as the Irish Church Surplus, has been drawn on for many purposes; a portion of it was used under the Act of 1882, to pay off the rents of tenants who were in arrears.—TR.

those regions where the private schools seemed insufficient, the government received the right to institute a school board, elected by the taxpayers, which was empowered to levy a tax for building and maintaining public schools, to compel parents to send their children to school, and to exempt the poor from the school fees. The public schools had to be non-sectarian, but the Bible might be taught. The educational committee became a sort of ministry of instruction, charged with the organization and direction of the schools. It was a system of public education, compulsory and independent of the Church, but which at the same time did not interfere with private, voluntary, and sectarian schools.

The ministry abolished the old custom of purchase in the English army. They had carried the measure in the House of Commons, but the Lords rejected it; they then accomplished the reform by royal order, withdrawing the royal warrant on which the system of purchasing commissions rested (1871).*

Finally the ministry, carrying out the promise made to the Radicals, reformed the voting process. The Radicals since 1832 had been vainly calling for secret ballot, to make voters independent, and to sustain them against the pressure of the aristocracy and clergy. The reform of 1867 had preserved the ancient system of *viva voce* voting. The old parties had held to this because it gave landlords an opportunity to observe the votes of their tenants; they defended it theoretically on the ground that voting, being a public function, should be carried on in public. At last (1872) the Liberal party resigned itself to the establishment of the secret ballot. They followed the plan invented by the English democratic colony of Victoria in Australia:

*The army regulations fixed a money value for commissions of regimental officers, ranging, in the infantry, from £450 for an ensigncy, to £4500 for a lieutenant-colonelcy. Before receiving his commission of any grade the appointee had to pay into the "reserve fund" the price named in the regulation. Further, any holder of a commission could resign it at any time (during peace) and obtain out of the "reserve fund," a sum at least equal to the various payments he had made into it. The avowed object of the system was to provide a safe competence for retiring officers, without burdening the state with pensions. As promotion went by seniority, the younger officers had strong reasons for desiring speedy retirement of those at the top. A practice had grown up of making large private payments to the higher officers as an inducement to retire. When the government cancelled the system, it reimbursed the officers then in service for the "over-regulation" sums they had paid.—about £10,000,000,

the election officer has a ticket printed containing the names of all the candidates; each voter receives this ticket and marks with a cross the candidate for whom he votes.

Gladstone next proposed to establish in Ireland a university independent of the Church (1873); but the majority would no longer follow him; they rejected the scheme.

Trade Union Legislation.—The workingmen who had aided in bringing about the electoral reform now called for a reform in the laws governing associations. Their professional syndicates, the trade unions, were simply tolerated, not recognised; the Act of 1825 (see chapter ii.) permitted coalition between workingmen, but with certain restrictions so interpreted that justices of the peace might condemn to imprisonment labourers who abused a comrade unwilling to strike. The old law regarding *Master and Servant* recognised the legal inequality between employer and employee; if an employer broke the contract or discharged the employee, he had only to pay damages; if the employee broke the contract, he incurred the penalty of three months' imprisonment, a single justice of the peace having the power to arrest and condemn him without appeal. In these cases the employer could testify; the employee, being the accused, could not. During the single year of 1863 it was estimated that there had been more than ten thousand prosecutions of workingmen.

In the period of industrial prosperity which followed 1860 a great strike was made for a rise of wages and a lessening of the hours of labour. The employers retaliated with *lock-outs*, and, as formerly in 1834 (see chapter iii.), with the demand that no man working for them should belong to a union.

Some workmen in Sheffield avenged themselves by violence—on one occasion by the use of dynamite in destroying buildings (1866). Public opinion attributed these acts to the influence of the trade unions, and it became the custom in England for some years to curse the unions for throwing workingmen into wretchedness by exciting them to strikes or working on their fears to make them submit to the despotic orders of the unions. Secretaries of associations were represented as adventurers who lived at the expense of the labouring classes. The government appointed a commission of inquiry on the abuses committed by the unions. It was proved in evidence before the commission that some officers of unions had been guilty of hiring ruffians to maim and even murder labourers who refused to obey the orders of the union; that gross and brutal oppression was

•

habitually practised on labourers who declined to join the organizations. The commission, while faithfully reporting these enormities, expressed the opinion that the existing law, by denying legal status to the union, tended rather to provoke than to repress violent action. A judicial decree had decided that trade unions had no legal recognition, could not hold title to property nor maintain actions in the courts in defence of their rights. The reason was that their objects were regarded as illegal, being in the nature of restraints on the freedom of industry. The commissioners recommended that the law be so changed as to enable trade unions to hold property and maintain actions in the courts, in the same way as Friendly Societies.

The Liberal ministry, following this advice, passed the Act of 1871, which recognised trade unions as capable of holding property and of maintaining and defending actions at law. But to satisfy the great manufacturers they passed at the same time an amendment to the criminal law. This amendment forbade strikers, under penalty of imprisonment, to station "pickets" to warn labourers against taking places left vacant by them, or to threaten, molest, or obstruct any labourer in order to cause him to leave an employment. Unions and strikes were made lawful, but the use of violent means to make a strike succeed remained unlawful. The act defines the forbidden "threats" to be such as would entitle the person threatened to have the threatener placed under bond to keep the peace.

The trade unions began an agitation for the repeal of this law. Their common central organ, created in 1867, the "Association of United Trades" was replaced by a Parliamentary committee (1871) charged with the task of influencing members of Parliament. This committee demanded the repeal of the Act of 1871; Gladstone refused it. The working classes then abandoned the Liberal party, which was put in a minority at the general election of 1874.

The Imperialist Policy of the Conservative Ministry (1874-80).—The Liberal ministry had little lost its majority; it had alienated the Dissenters by accepting the church schools as part of the new system and by allowing religious instruction to be given in the public schools; it had alienated the working classes by refusing to repeal the Act of 1871. Gladstone dissolved Parliament. In the new House of Commons, elected in January, 1874, the Conservatives for the first time since 1847, had a majority (of nearly fifty votes).

.

The Conservative ministry governed six and a half years with this majority. Its leader, Disraeli (made Lord Beaconsfield in 1876), had only a negative program for home affairs: to uphold the institutions of old England—royalty, the House of Lords, and the Anglican Church—against the attacks of the Radicals. But he expressed this traditional policy under a new form. Being an orator and a novelist, he inclined toward theatrical attitudes and literary forms. He was credited with aiming to give the Conservatives a policy and spirit altogether different from that of the old aristocratic Tories. He belonged to a converted Jewish family, and had come forward first as a Radical candidate expressing in his early speeches and later in the novel "Sybil" his sympathy with the Chartist labourers. Even when he had become a Conservative member, he continued to ridicule the prevailing ideas of the aristocracy; he compared the English government from 1688 to 1832 to the constitution of Venice; he accused the aristocratic families of having usurped the royal power, and talked of "emancipating the sovereign" from the tyranny of Parliament and founding a government on three forces, the monarchy, the Church, and the people. Later he declared that the Conservative party had three great objects: to preserve the national Church, to keep the English Empire intact, and to raise the condition of the people. He appealed to the people to support the sovereign and the Church; in return for which the sovereign should improve the material condition of the people, and the Church their moral condition. His ideal was an ecclesiastical and democratic monarchy—a combination of the conceptions of Napoleon III., Bismarck, and Leo XIII. With the exception of the act of 1875 on strikes and some reforms of detail (in schools, public health, and care of the poor), the Conservative ministry did little that was noteworthy in domestic policy. It occupied itself mainly with external matters. Disraeli tried to excite English patriotism by adopting a warlike policy in the name of English honour, compromised, as he said, by Gladstone's neutral policy.

He directed this patriotic agitation toward two subjects—the English colonies and the Eastern question. The Liberal influence was tending toward the separation of the colonies from the mother country. Distant dependencies the Liberals regarded simply as a useless expense. The Conservatives declared for the "integrity of the British Empire," and looked toward tightening the bonds between England and her colonies by a military and

commercial federation. The government proclaimed the Queen Empress of India. They attempted a federation of Southern Africa, which ended in the war of the Transvaal.

In the Eastern question Disraeli declared for the support of the Ottoman Empire. Gladstone checked him for a time by exciting popular opinion against the Turks as guilty of the "Bulgarian atrocities" (the title of Gladstone's pamphlet). He organized in 1876 great indignation meetings in the large cities. But Parliament decided to approve interference; England, as at the time of the Crimean War, adopted a warlike policy and played an active part in European affairs. Beaconsfield took part in the Congress of Berlin, and on his return was triumphantly received in London (1878).

The Conservative ministry also ended the Ashanti war in 1874, and began the war in Afghanistan and that against the Zulus.

The act of 1875 on strikes repealed Gladstone's criminal law amendment of 1871; it also repealed the old law of Master and Servant. Labourers who broke their agreements by leaving their work were no longer to be subject to imprisonment, except in cases where the desertion inflicts injury on the public or willfully endangers life or property. They became liable, instead, to a civil action for damages. Also, they were no longer to be adjudged guilty of criminal conspiracy, for agreeing to do in common anything that was not criminal when done by a single individual. The new law retains the prohibitions against the use of violence and intimidation in furtherance of strikes; persistent following of men, watching or besetting their place of abode or of work, subject the offenders to fine or imprisonment. The new law satisfied the labour unions and has remained in force.

Formation of the Irish Home Rule Party.—Under the Conservative ministry there sprang up in Ireland a new opposition party which by a new policy acquired a decisive influence over internal affairs in England. Until now the English had occupied themselves with Ireland only intermittently. The Irish question had faced each generation (1801, 1820-29, 1843-48, 1865-67) and it was never settled. The Irish people remained miserable and unhappy, but when they stopped active demonstrations, it was said that the English forgot all about them. The Irish opposition existed no longer except in two classes of men working independently. In Parliament there was a little group of Irish home-rule representatives, standing outside the great parties, formed of insignificant men little considered by their richer col-

leagues. In Ireland there was an agrarian party, made up of young men who avenged themselves for eviction by shooting landlords or their agents and by mutilating cattle. These modes of vengeance had been practised since the eighteenth century and in the nineteenth century there had always been in Ireland men ready to resort to violence. *Whiteboys* and *moonlighters* were so called because they preferred to do their work at night; they did not, however, form a political party. There were still a few Fenians, but they were without organization.

The Irish had demanded first the repeal of the Act of Union, then a republic. The Parliamentary group adopted a new name, that of the Home Rule party; they demanded not complete separation, but a home government directed by an Irish Parliament.

This party at first had no influence, the House of Commons taking little account of its Irish members. The situation changed when Parnell took the leadership of the Home Rule party. He was a Protestant and of English family, but brought up in Ireland and devoted to the cause of Irish independence. He induced the party to adopt a new policy in the English Parliament and in Ireland.

In Parliament his principle was to form an Irish party entirely separate from the English parties, not allying itself to one to oppose the other as in O'Connell's time, but devoting itself to blocking the work of the Parliament. The aim was to stop the progress of English affairs until the Irish question should be settled. The customs of the English Parliament, consecrated by tradition, recognised the right of every member to speak for an indefinite length of time. Now every member could propose an amendment on every line of every bill; could call for a vote by division, which takes time, and could make after each vote a motion to adjourn or raise the question whether there was a quorum present and demand a count of the House. It was therefore easy for a small number of determined members to stop the progress of business at will.

This plan, known as *obstruction*, had been a little employed by every party when in minority, but only on rare occasions. Parnell made a systematic practice of it. The Irish members, having arranged to relieve each other, began a series of discourses which were not even reported in the papers, and dragged out the sessions interminably; in the discussion of the South Africa Act (1877) the Wednesday session lasted until two o'clock Thursday afternoon. The obstruction of the "Irish brigade" became so

annoying that the House of Commons, in defiance of established custom, gave its Speaker the power to call for a vote on the suspension of any member guilty of wilfully and persistently obstructing the business of the House. In 1879 it was estimated that during a single session of Parliament a certain Irish member had spoken 500 times, another 369.

In Ireland the Parliamentary party came to an understanding with the leaders of the land party. Davitt, an old Fenian convict, brought back in 1877, started a defensive association among the peasants which presently became the "Land League"; it was founded in Galloway and then extended to all Ireland (1879). The act of 1870 did not prevent the landlord from exacting an extortionate rent nor from driving out a tenant who did not pay his rent. By reason of several short crops, coupled with a fall in prices of farm produce, many peasants could not pay their rent. The number of evictions increased accordingly (from 1269 in 1876 to 2267 in 1879). The Land League adopted a program summed up in three catchwords: 1st, *fixity of tenure*, the right of the tenant to hold his land so long as he paid his rent; 2d, *free sale*, the right of the tenant to sell his holding; 3d, *fair rent*, which was explained to be the annual value of the land in its natural state ("prairie value"). These were known as the three F's. Their intended effect was to reduce the landlord to the position of a mere rent-receiver and to transform the Irish peasants into small proprietors burdened only with a small fixed rent. To compel the landlords to yield, Parnell advised those peasants who had received notice to quit to stand by their farms until they were driven out, trusting that many landlords would shrink from the costly process of police eviction. The Land League was itself to aid peasants who resisted, the members of the League pledging themselves not to take the place of an evicted tenant.

But there was no money to carry on this struggle. Parnell called for contributions from Irish patriots in America. He made a tour of the United States, was received there as the representative of Ireland, and returned with the sum of seventy-two thousand pounds sterling (1879-80).

The Home Rule party had combined three forces, the Irish peasants, the Irish members, and the Irish in America. In Ireland it worked upon the peasants by the promise of improving their material condition; it made them desire an Irish Parliament to make the land reform; it made them elect Home Rule candidates. In England it employed the Irish members in forcing

the attention of Parliament to the Irish question with the hope of securing home rule. In America it gathered the necessary funds for the national agitation.

The party, definitely organized in 1879, elected Parnell as its leader.

Struggle between the Liberal Ministry and the Irish Party (1880-85).—The Conservative ministry had all this time kept its majority in the House of Commons. After the success of the Congress of Berlin the common opinion was that the elections of 1880 would return a Tory majority. But the voters, probably indifferent to the foreign policy and discontented by reason of business depression and a series of bad crops, deserted the Conservatives. The elections of 1880 gave the Liberals an unexpected majority (349 Liberals, 235 Conservatives, and 63 Home Rulers).

The Liberal ministry under Gladstone, which now assumed charge of the government, was occupied with the struggle against the Irish party and with electoral reform. Abroad it began the English occupation of Egypt and came to an agreement with Russia as to the Afghan boundary.

The ministry tried in the session of 1880 to appease the Irish by a bill designed to protect tenants against eviction for non-payment of rent, in cases where the courts were satisfied that the failure to pay was due to inability. The bill was not accepted by the Irish members, and was eventually rejected by the House of Lords. In the Home Rule party those in favour of keeping up the struggle had just got the better of those who favoured alliance with the Liberals: Parnell had been re-elected as leader by a vote of twenty-three to eighteen.

The Home Rule party declared the government scheme insufficient and again demanded radical reform—the suppression of landlordism and the concession of national home rule. The Irish agitation, instead of quieting down, increased in violence. Agrarian crimes, that is to say, murders and other acts of violence against landlords, became more numerous. New devices were directed against the enemies of the League. They were put under “boycott”; no Irishman would have anything to do with them; they could find neither man nor woman willing to work for them, nor any tradesman to sell them anything. This procedure, first applied to Captain Boycott (November, 1880), became known under the name of the earliest victim. Active resistance to eviction, boycotting, and personal acts of vengeance

made the situation intolerable to Irish landlords. A deputation of 105 great proprietors entreated the Viceroy of Ireland to protect them and to keep their names secret, for fear of bringing down upon them the vengeance of the League.

The government decided to fight it out. They instituted proceedings against the leaders of the League, accusing them of keeping farmers from paying their rent and landlords from renting their lands. Parnell continued his campaign in Ireland.

The government then brought up a measure providing for the repression of agrarian and political crimes in Ireland. The Irish party retaliated by organizing obstruction against this coercion bill. The session of Jan. 31, 1881, beginning Monday at four o'clock, lasted without interruption until Wednesday morning. The Speaker then refused to hear any more speeches, and the bill passed the first reading in spite of the Irish protestations. The House of Commons passed in 1881 a provisional regulation for closing debate. In 1882 it adopted a permanent rule for the compulsory close of debate, with the restriction that the Speaker alone should have the right of suggesting the proceeding, and that if forty members voted against closing debate the number of votes on the other side must be at least two hundred; otherwise the debate should go on.*

In the session of 1881 Gladstone succeeded in passing the Second Irish Land Act. This measure adopted the three F's in a modified form. It set up a Land Court in Ireland, with power to fix the rent of farms on request of either tenant or landlord. At the rent so fixed, subject however to revision at intervals of fifteen years, it gave tenants the right to hold their farms in perpetuity. It also gave them the privilege of selling their tenancies to any solvent person wishing to buy. In case of non-payment of rent, the landlord may sell the tenant-right, but must pay over to the outgoing tenant whatever sum is obtained for it, in excess of the arrears of rent. The measure was opposed and denounced by Parnell's followers in Parliament, on the ground that it was utterly inadequate to settle Irish grievances. After it was passed they tried to prevent the peasantry from taking advantage of its provisions.

* In 1887 the requirement was reduced to one hundred; and it was made possible for any member to move the closure without a previous intimation from the Speaker. The Speaker is, however, to decline to put the motion unless he thinks the subject in hand has been "adequately discussed."—Tr.

The government made use of the exceptional laws to arrest some of the Irish leaders; but the number of evictions increased and the Irish party went on with the fight. Its leaders tried to prevent the tenantry from taking advantage of the new law. A "national convention" of twelve hundred delegates, convoked by the Land League at Dublin, passed the declaration that "the cause of political and social evils is the system of foreign domination," and that the only remedy is to give Ireland the right to govern herself (September, 1881). Gladstone denounced "the new gospel of pillage" and "Mr. Parnell's tyranny," and declared himself firm in maintaining English rule and rights of property. Then he had Parnell arrested. Parnell replied with the no-rent manifesto, calling upon peasants to stop the payment of rent until the coercive measures were abandoned. The government declared the League dissolved (October, 1881). The League transported its headquarters to England, and a league of women led by Parnell's sister kept up the fight at home.

After several months of agitation, arrests, and prosecutions the ministry made up their minds to a reconciliation, and made arrangements with the Irish leaders imprisoned at Kilmainham. This was known as the "Kilmainham treaty." The ministry released the prisoners and promised them a law remitting arrears of rent to the tenants.

But a small revolutionary body, the Invincibles, were holding by the Fenian traditions, and wished an armed revolt and a complete separation from England. These men upbraided the Home Rulers for demanding only a Home Rule Parliament, and rejected their policy of legal resistance. In order to make a reconciliation impossible, they assassinated in broad daylight, in a Dublin park, the secretary and under-secretary for Ireland (May 6, 1882). The ministry replied with a bill which instituted trial by magistrates without juries, and placed Ireland under coercion for three years.

The violent revolutionists, allied with societies in America, tried, like the Russian revolutionists, the effect of dynamite explosions to compel the English to grant Irish home rule. They worked in England at the very doors of the government; there was an explosion in the local government office in 1883, in the vestibule of the House of Commons in January, 1885, and in 1883 a band was discovered which was making dynamite at Birmingham and at Liverpool with which to blow up public buildings. This scheme was avowed in the United States at a public

meeting by an Irish revolutionist named O'Donovan Rossa; the only way to get any concession from England, he said, was by terrorizing her.

In Ireland a national subscription was taken up in honour of Parnell, and at the banquet where the money was handed to him the toast to the Queen was replaced by a toast to "Ireland as a nation."

Electoral Reform (1884-85).—Many Liberals had long been calling for electoral reform. They were trying especially to do away with the inequality between boroughs and counties. The conference of Liberal representatives which met in October, 1883, determined to get the measure passed. The Gladstone ministry presented it in two parts and carried it in the House of Commons without resistance (1884); all parties were agreed that such a reform was necessary. Even the Lords only delayed it a little (1885).

For the first time the reformers were not content with a redistribution of seats; they created new seats, increasing the number of members to 670. This was done to facilitate the apportionment of seats.

They made a systematic attempt to lessen inequalities by making the provisions uniform.

First. The franchise, or right of voting, hitherto differing in the counties and boroughs, was brought under the same rules. The borough franchise was extended to the counties, thus nearly trebling the number of county voters by the admission of the agricultural labourers.

Second. The smaller boroughs had had hitherto an excessive share of the representation. It was estimated that on an average the boroughs had one member for 41,000 inhabitants, the counties one member for 78,000; the boroughs therefore had, for the same population, almost double the representation of the counties. The act took away separate representation from 105 boroughs with a population under 16,000 and left only one member each to 37 boroughs under 50,000. It redistributed the seats thus gained to the counties and to cities of over 165,000 inhabitants, in the rough proportion of 1 member to 50,000. The cities and counties were divided into districts so as to have everywhere single-member districts, except in the case of 34 boroughs having two members each. The experiment of "three-cornered" constituencies, tried in 1867 with a view to giving minority representation in cities having three members, was abandoned. The prin-

ciple was that of the so-called "limited vote"—each voter being allowed to vote for only two of the three members assigned to his city. It had proved unsatisfactory to the Liberals of the cities.

This was not, however, a sweeping reform. The English electoral system still preserved from its old organization of established custom, several remnants which bring out the lack of a complete plan, and mark its unlikeness to the electoral systems of the continent, which are based on rational principles. Following their traditional practice, the English, in creating new ways of getting the right to vote, have taken care to preserve the old ways. There is, therefore, now a medley of ways by which the right of voting may be acquired. But they may be reduced to two general classes:

(a) Residence within the district either in a separate house or in a tenement worth £10 a year. In this qualification there is no question of ownership—it is the simple residence in the house or the lodging, as the person in responsible charge, that confers the right of voting.

(b) Ownership of land worth £5 a year within the district by freehold or copyhold, or possession of the like amount under lease; or the mere tenancy-at-will of land worth £12 a year in the district. In these qualifications there is no question of residence; the mere holding of land in the district confers the right, no matter where the holder resides. These qualifications belong to the county franchise; a man can still vote at elections in every county where he holds land in any of the ways named, except in the county where he has a vote by residence. Men who are neither householders nor £10-lodgers, nor holders of land in one of the ways named, have no votes. It was estimated in 1885 that there were 1,800,000 men shut out from the right of voting, sons of families living at home, men living in cheap or temporary lodgings, workmen lodging with their employers.

Further peculiarities of the English electoral system are that:

(c) Registration as a voter is not a matter of course. There are formalities preceding registration; a man must have had at least a year's residence in the place where he registers, and this shuts out many workingmen who have moved from one town or county to another within the election year.

(d) The election is not held on the same day all over the country.

(e) The election is still settled by a plurality vote; there is no second balloting. This system sometimes results in the election

of Conservative candidates in districts where there is not a Conservative majority, or else it prevents the Radicals from casting their votes for the candidates of their own choice by compelling them to vote for the Liberal candidate.

(f) Parliament retains its term of seven years as a right. It is indeed a common thing to dissolve Parliament before the seven years are up; but it is the government that decides it, so that the duration of the House of Commons depends upon the will of the ministry.

(g) Members do not receive pay, and the election expenses, which are still very heavy, are paid by the candidates. As the right of voting is attached to the property or the domicile, and women are not expressly excluded, an attempt was made to secure woman's suffrage on this basis; the courts, however, rejected this interpretation. The House has since approved the principle, but the principle only.

Disruption of the Liberal Party (1885-86).—The Gladstone ministry, having become unpopular through alleged weakness in dealing with the Afghan question and with the affairs of Egypt and South Africa, retired after a defeat on a minor point in the budget in June, 1885. It was left in a minority of 12 votes, owing to the abstention of some 50 Liberal members. The Conservative ministry under Salisbury which succeeded, not having a majority in the Commons, maintained itself only through Gladstone's forbearance. As in 1868, they waited until the new electoral system should be in working order before dissolving the House. The ministers tried to win over the Irish party by declaring that they would not demand the renewal of the exceptional laws for Ireland.

At the elections of November, 1885, the liberals presented a program of democratic reforms. Gladstone demanded a more equal distribution of taxes, an administrative reform which should give the direction of local affairs to elective bodies, a reform in the House of Lords, a land reform to give a small piece of land to each farm labourer, so as to transform him into a peasant landowner. The election cry was "three acres and a cow." As to Ireland, he declared himself ready to grant all the local rights compatible with the unity of the Empire, but he strongly opposed the re-establishment of a Parliament in Dublin. To this program Chamberlain, the leader of the Radical division of the Liberal party, added the disestablishment of the Anglican Church.

It was said that Parnell advised the Irish to vote for the Tory

candidates where they had no candidates of their own. There were rumours of an arrangement between the two parties which had been opposing Gladstone. Parnell was preparing to adopt a policy more effective than obstruction; it was not simply to prevent the English Parliament from attending to English affairs, but to get the English ministry in the power of the Irish party. If the two great parties should have each only a minority, the Irish party, holding the balance in its hand, would become the dispenser of power and could name its own conditions. This plan succeeded. In the Parliament elected in 1885 there were 333 Liberals, 251 Conservatives, and 86 *Irish Home Rulers*. The Conservative ministry, even if it succeeded in making a working alliance with the Home Rulers, would still not have a sufficient majority to carry on the government. It therefore abandoned whatever projects it may have had looking to such an alliance. Gladstone, on the other hand, found in the situation reasons for a new departure in the Irish question. He accepted the policy of granting home rule. When the new Parliament met in January, 1886, there were rumours of an agreement between him and Parnell. On an amendment to the address in answer to the Queen's speech, the Home Rulers voted with the Liberals and defeated the ministry. Gladstone was called on to form a new ministry.

From now on English political discussion was entirely taken up with the question of the best policy to adopt towards Ireland. And on this question the Liberal party broke up. Gladstone joined the Irish, and proposed home rule as a measure of justice and reparation, also as the best practical method of establishing peace in Ireland. The great majority of the Liberal-Radical party followed him. One section, however, broke away, maintaining that the *Union* must be preserved first of all, and opposing home rule as a dismemberment of the Empire. These Liberal "Dissenters" took the name of "Liberal-Unionists"; they included most of the leading men of the Liberal party in both houses of Parliament.

The division began when Gladstone was forming his Cabinet; many of his old colleagues refused to join it. When he later communicated to his Cabinet his plans in regard to Ireland, several who had joined it, including Chamberlain, the new Radical leader, withdrew. The breach became definitive when the project was put before the House of Commons. Gladstone proposed to create an Irish Parliament consisting of one House of two

Orders, and a responsible executive council like the English Cabinet; but reserving to the English government the control of matters of common concern: customs and excise duties, commercial legislation, army and navy, foreign policy. In the Parliament where these matters were to be settled for Ireland as well as Great Britain, Ireland was to have no voice.

In England public opinion was distinctly hostile to the scheme. In Ireland, the Ulster Protestants, who had long been organized in secret societies (lodges), forming a national English party called the *Orangemen*, made violent protests, and got up a league against home rule. They did not limit themselves to a protest against the ministerial project, but organized militia, announcing their intentions to fight rather than accept the rule of an Irish Parliament. The Ulster women, to the number of 30,000, sent a petition to the Queen imploring her to refuse her consent to the bill. After passionate discussion in the House of Commons and in the newspapers, the bill was defeated by a vote of 341 to 311, in the midst of unparalleled excitement among the members and the public in the galleries (June 7, 1886).

Gladstone dissolved Parliament and appealed to the nation. The election was exclusively on the Irish question; it was a struggle, not between Liberals and Conservatives, but between Home Rulers and Unionists. The Liberal voters, surprised at Gladstone's rapid evolution, had not had time to accustom themselves to the idea of home rule; many refrained from voting. The Conservatives had the advantage of remaining united and presenting themselves as partisans of national unity, with the additional support of the Liberal Unionists. The election of 1886 swamped Gladstone's party; in England they had only 125 seats out of 455 (in London 11 out of 62); in Parliament there were only 191 Gladstonians and 86 Home Rulers, against 317 Conservatives and 75 Liberal-Unionists.

Party lines were shattered. Instead of two great parties alternating in power, there were two heterogeneous coalitions—the Home Rule coalition, made up of Gladstonian Liberals and Irish Nationalists; the Unionist coalition, made up of Conservatives and Liberal-Unionists.

The Government of the Unionist Coalition (1886-92).—The Unionist coalition had a majority of 116 votes; it held power for 6 years. The ministry (under Salisbury) was made up entirely of Conservatives, but governed with the support of the Liberal-Unionists.

The coalition had been formed to keep Ireland dependent on the central government; the ministry was chiefly occupied with the fight against the Irish Nationalist party. In Parliament the position of the Irish had changed. Instead of standing alone in systematic opposition, they joined the great Liberal party, which promised to demand for them Irish home rule. This party was supported mainly in the north of England and in the annexed countries, Scotland and Wales. It began to regard home rule as no longer an exceptional measure necessitated by Ireland's special condition, but as a normal system applicable to all parts of the Kingdom. Some of its members, therefore, began to demand autonomy and even separate Parliaments for Scotland, Wales, and England (or different parts of England). The British Empire would thus be transformed into a federation into which the colonies would necessarily enter. In adopting this program, the Home Rule party lost its exclusively Irish character to become a democratic federalist party. Against the Unionist majority it could accomplish nothing in Parliament, but it worked outside to regain the majority in the next elections.

The Land Court established by the act of 1881 had by this time succeeded in adjusting rents, directly or indirectly, over the greater part of Ireland. In most cases it made a considerable reduction from the old rents, on the average about 25 per cent. But the decline in prices, owing to American competition, went on, and presently there were complaints that even the reduced rents fixed in 1881-83 were too high for the changed situation of 1885-86. But the act of the three F's had enacted that rents once judicially adjusted should remain unchanged for 15 years, and the executive and courts could only uphold the law and the obligation of contracts. There was, further, a suspicion that many tenants who were abundantly able to fulfil their agreements, were induced to join in resistance to the law by the mere hope of financial advantage and the wish to embarrass a government which they disliked. A new tenant league, under the name "Plan of Campaign," endeavoured to enlist all tenants in a strike against payment of rents. The members claimed the right of determining for themselves the fair rent of their farms. This amount they placed in the hands of a committee to be tendered to the landlord, with an intimation that any expense they were put to in resisting eviction should be deducted from this rent. They bound themselves to stand by each other, using the boycott and other forms of terrorism to coerce all who were not disposed to obey their decrees.

Salisbury's Irish Policy.—The Salisbury ministry met this movement with two sets of measures. As juries refused to convict law-breakers, even in face of the clearest evidence, the government carried through Parliament an act authorizing the trial of offenders in the disturbed districts of Ireland without juries; also giving the Irish executive special powers in dealing with disorders. This act was passed with great difficulty, against the combined resistance of the Liberals and Home Rulers. Unlike previous acts of the kind, it was made a permanent measure and is still in force. While thus striving, and with success, to maintain the enforcement of law, the ministry gave its attention to measures for the industrial and social benefit of the Irish. Landlords were urged to be considerate in the assertion of their legal rights—advice which, happily, most of them did not need, having already made liberal concessions to their tenantry. A commission was appointed to inquire into the complaints regarding the judicial rents. Grants of money were made for building railroads and making other local improvements. Acting on the report of the commission just referred to, an act was passed in 1887 authorizing the land court to readjust rents fixed prior to 1886. Under this power the court made a general decree reducing such rents 20 per cent.

But the most important part of the ministerial program for Ireland was its measures for enabling the Irish peasants to buy their farms. Gladstone's land acts had provisions for assisting tenants in purchasing their land, by advancing two-thirds of the purchase price from the Treasury on very easy terms; but the provisions had been little used. The Salisbury ministry adopted the bold policy of advancing the whole sum. In the short ministry of 1885-6, the sum of £5,000,000 was appropriated for this purpose, by way of experiment. In 1888 the second Salisbury ministry appropriated another five millions. The plan met with so much success that the same ministry proposed and carried in 1891 a general Land Purchase Act, appropriating £33,000,000 additional for the purpose. Landlords are not compelled to sell, but they have proved to be willing to accept the price tenants are authorized to offer. The maximum price the law allows the government to pay is twenty years' purchase—that is to say, twenty times the yearly rent. The average of prices actually paid is seventeen years' purchase. From the moment of purchase, the peasant becomes full legal owner of the land, subject to the obligation of repaying the government loan. The terms of repay-

ment are extremely easy: $4\frac{3}{4}$ per cent. for the first five years and 4 per cent. for 44 years following. At the end of the forty-nine years the whole loan is, by this process, repaid in full. The government is able to borrow at $2\frac{3}{4}$ per cent., and the excess over this rate paid annually by the peasants goes toward paying off the principal.

The immediate gain for the peasant is best illustrated by an example: A peasant who has been paying £10 rent gets an advance of £170 in order to purchase his holding. For the first five years he pays the government $4\frac{3}{4}$ per cent. on this sum—£8 a year. For the remaining 44 years he pays 4 per cent.—£7 a year. That is to say, his annual payment falls from £10 to £8, then to £7; and at the end of 49 years he owns the farm free from incumbrance.

Up to the middle of 1896 loans had been made to 34,700 tenants for the purchase of their farms. The movement had slackened, however, probably because there is an expectation of a further reduction of rents at the end of the first fifteen-years' term under the act of 1881. Applications for a second fixing of rents had begun to be made in the first half of 1896. Of course a reduction of rents would result in a corresponding reduction of prices on purchase. Meanwhile the relations between all classes in Ireland have become much improved. Agrarian crimes, boycotting, and political disorders have practically ceased.

General Legislation of the Unionist Coalition (1886-92).—The Irish measures of the second Salisbury ministry encountered a vigorous and persistent opposition in the House of Commons. In this opposition the Irish Home Rulers had the help of the Gladstonian Liberals. Debates, prolonged and bitter, were raised at every stage of every business. The ministers, in order to hasten the progress of their business, carried in 1887 a change in the rules of the House, sharpening the process of closure established by Gladstone in 1882. Under the rule of 1882 the proceeding for stoppage of debate could be initiated by no one but the Speaker. Not until the Speaker had declared his opinion that the question in hand had been adequately discussed, adding that the House seemed to him to desire an end of the debate, could any member move the closure. It had been found in practice, however, that the Speaker, unwilling to abandon the traditional attitude of impartial good-will toward all sides of the House, would not give the necessary signal so long as any considerable body of members wished debate to go on. Palpable, scarcely

disguised obstruction had been freely practised between 1882 and 1887, and yet the closure had been applied only two or three times. Under the new rule, any member of the House could move the close of debate on any question, and this motion is to be put forthwith, unless the Speaker gives it as his opinion that the question has not been adequately discussed. In this form the closure became an effective instrument for cutting off interminable debate. Under the rule of 1882, if forty members voted against closing a debate, the vote in favour of closing had to be at least two hundred, in order to prevail. It had been found almost impossible to keep so large a number of the ministerial supporters on hand till two or three o'clock in the morning—the time when closure is ordinarily needed. The required number was therefore cut down to one hundred. Further, the American practice of fixing in advance a day and hour for closing the committee stage of bills was introduced, but without the American allowance of two five-minute speeches on each pending amendment. In the English method all amendments not discussed when the hour arrives are rejected in the lump. This was denounced by the opposition as “not closure, but guillotine.” But, as usual in such cases, they used the same procedure themselves when, in 1892, they assumed charge of affairs.

Next to their Irish measures, the most important act of the Unionist ministry was the reform of county administration in 1888, carried for the sake of satisfying their Radical allies. The traditional system gave all local power in the counties to the justices of the peace, that is to say, to the local aristocracy. The act of 1888 established county councils elected for a term of 3 years by the rate payers and Parliamentary voters. These bodies are made up, like municipal councils, of councillors, aldermen, and a presiding officer, bearing the title of chairman, however, not of mayor. To these councils are intrusted a majority of the non-judicial functions of the justices of the peace, construction and care of court houses, jails, infirmaries, bridges, houses of correction, control of cattle plagues, licensing of shows, etc., with the right to levy taxes and to negotiate loans. This was a new administrative body superior to the old unions of parishes. The larger counties are divided for these purposes—each division having a council of its own. Each of the larger cities and boroughs is treated as a county by itself. There are 60 administrative counties and 61 “counties of boroughs,” each of the latter being a city with more than 60,000 inhabitants. The greatest of all is the County of

London, made up from the boroughs surrounding the city, with nearly five millions of inhabitants. The London County Council has almost the proportions of a Parliament. The same system of councils was extended to Scotland in 1889. It has now, by the act of 1898, been extended to Ireland also, with slight modifications.

To satisfy the Radicals, these county councils are required, on petition of workmen demanding it, to buy land and sell it again in small lots. The object is to create a class of peasant landholders.

The Salisbury ministry carried out, in 1890, a conversion of the national debt, reducing greatly the annual interest and providing for a still further reduction later. They also began a large scheme of naval construction, intended to make and keep the navy superior in force to any other two national navies combined.

In Ireland there came a division in the Nationalist party. First, the Pope, by an encyclical, condemned the plan of campaign (1888), compelling the Irish priests to retire from the land agitation. Then Mr. Parnell was compromised* by scandalous revelations in conjunction with a divorce trial (1890). The English Dissenters, supporters of the Gladstonian party, threatened to break off all connection with the Irish party if they retained such a man as their leader. The group of Irish members in Parliament fell into bitter feud among themselves. The great majority, in order to preserve their alliance with the English Liberals, elected a new leader; their choice fell on Mr. Justin McCarthy, the historian and literary man. A small but determined minority stood by their former leader. This meant the formation of two Irish parties—the anti-Parnellite party, to whose ranks the Catholic priests, hostile to Parnell, led the mass of voters; the Parnellite party, independent of the Church and revolutionary in spirit, made up of the more ardent Nationalists. These two factions began a passionate war against each other.

Parnell's death in 1891 did not altogether restore harmony, and the Irish party remained weakened. The ministry finally proposed to Parliament a special bill to establish local administration in Ireland (1892), but could not get it passed before the dissolution.

* The letters published by the *Times* in 1888 to prove that Parnell had known and approved the Irish outrages of 1882, were proved to be forgeries in the famous investigation of 1889. Pigott, the man who had forged them, committed suicide.

Formation of the Socialist Parties (1884-92).—During the struggle between the Unionists and the Nationalists, a new political party had sprung up, the Socialist party.

For a long time there had been in England but few Socialists except isolated doctrinaires, without political interest. Two small societies attacked the English system of land-holding, which concentrated the control of the land in the hands of a few landlords, and reduced the peasants to the condition of day labourers.

The "League for the Nationalization of the Land," founded in Scotland by Wallace the naturalist (1880), demanded that the estates should be taken from the landlords with proper compensation, and become the collective property of the nation. The "League for the Restitution of the Land," founded by the disciples of Henry George, declared that the land belonged to the nation, which had a right to seize it without compensation. As a practical procedure they proposed a "single tax of 20 shillings in the pound," that is to say, a tax equal to the income from the land. But the two leagues were recruited almost wholly from the middle classes. The "Social Democratic Federation," founded in 1880 by Hyndmann, a disciple of Marx, tried to spread among workingmen the doctrine of the German Socialists, but had difficulty in getting together even a few thousand adherents.

The Parliamentary Committee of the Trade Unions, which officially represented the various labour organizations, remained faithful to the Radical program, and rejected the socialistic propositions issued by the congress of delegates—that for nationalization of the land in 1882, and that for a law limiting the working day to eight hours in 1883. The belief was created in England and in Europe that English workingmen, thanks to the strong organization of their trade unions and their practical spirit, were destined to remain always opposed to the spread of socialism. But there have been signs of late that a modified form of socialism is gaining a foothold in England.

A significant change has come about in the trade unions. The majority of them were formerly syndicates of the technical trades, those which required skilled labour. The workmen in these trades, better paid and better educated than the general mass, were more disposed to pay the necessary contribution for keeping up a relief fund. The unskilled labourers and farm hands remained outside of the unions.

A new movement, directed by the Socialist workingmen Tom Mann and John Burns, was set on foot after the general strike of the labourers in the London docks in 1889. The public had supported the strikers and made the strike a success. Unskilled workmen began to organize: dock and wharf labourers, navvies, gas-men, sailors, and even farm hands (1889-90). Unlike the old unions, the new unions asked only a small contribution and gave up the plan of working as mutual aid societies. Their object was simply to establish a fighting organization, to take their part in politics and become a political force.

In the old unions the number of members increased rapidly (in the 10 great trade unions of builders, from 57,000 in 1888 to 94,000 in 1891) and the majority of them adopted a new program. Their ordinary principle, since the failure of the great agitations from 1834 to 1848, had been to accept the system of freedom in labour contracts, and to associate in order to oblige employers to maintain a living wage and satisfactory hours of labour, without having recourse to state interference. This principle, maintained by the better paid workmen (builders, mechanics, metal-workers) and by the miners in the extreme north, became the doctrine of the official leaders of the labour organizations—the general secretaries and members of the Parliamentary committee who formed the “general staff” of the working classes. But the lower ranks of workmen, especially the cotton-spinners and miners, declared association to be insufficient for opposing the employers, and demanded laws fixing a minimum wage and the maximum working day. They secured in 1878 the ten-hour law for women and children. This new doctrine extended little by little to all trades. The change began with a severe struggle between the advocates of the old and the new policy. It ended in a disagreement between the central committee, which had remained faithful to the doctrine of non-interference from the state, and the mass of delegates to the congress, which was beginning to pass socialistic resolutions. The congress finally enforced its policy; the delegates from the various trade unions officially announced themselves in sympathy with Socialist measures; in 1888 with the nationalization of the land; in 1890 with the statutory eight-hour day.

A Socialist Labour party sprang up first in Scotland (1888), then in England. At the elections of 1892 two Socialists were elected, the first to sit in the English Parliament.

The Fourth Gladstone Ministry (1892-94).—During the years

1886-92 the Liberals had been gradually winning back their old supporters who had left the party on the home rule question. They regained their lost seats at almost all the by-elections. At the general election of 1892 the Liberals came forward with a Radical program. Gladstone himself, since 1891, had been proposing, besides home rule for Ireland, the electoral reform known as "one man, one vote," payment of members, reform of the House of Lords, disestablishment of the Episcopal Church in Wales, and the establishment of parish councils.

The elections of July, 1892, gave the Liberals a smaller majority than had been expected: 355 for Gladstone (275 Liberals, 80 Home Rulers) against 315 (270 Conservatives and 45 Liberal-Unionists). The Gladstonians had made their chief gain from the Liberal-Unionists, who lost 32 seats. But their majority was all from Ireland and Scotland; in England the Unionist coalition still held a majority of 71 seats.

This English majority for the Unionists made the new Liberal ministry (under Gladstone) powerless to carry any important contested measure. It gave the House of Lords, with its great majority hostile to home rule, the strength to resist the ministry. In refusing bills passed by the Commons, the Lords presented themselves as champions of English public opinion against the enemies of national unity.

Gladstone presented a new home rule bill, giving Ireland a local Parliament, with an executive ministry responsible to it. This bill, different from that of 1886, proposed to retain Irish members, to the number of 80, in the London Parliament, but without a right to vote on purely English or Scotch questions. Also it abandoned the plan of a single chamber composed of two orders, and proposed an Upper House elected for a long term by a select class of voters.

The bill was passed by the Commons in 82 days, after violent debates, by a majority of 40 votes. It was rejected by a vote of 419 against 41 in the House of Lords. Gladstone, wearied of the contest, retired, leaving his place to a young peer, Lord Rosebery. The Liberals had now no longer a popular leader. They had lost many of their supporters by subordinating everything to the Irish question, in which few Englishmen were deeply interested. To satisfy the mass of the people, they now adopted a purely Radical program. The ministry brought forward successively several democratic projects: employers' liability; pay for members without private fortunes; an electoral reform to bring elections

on the same day all over the United Kingdom; abolition of the right of plural voting (the reform known as "one man, one vote"), and a reduction of the period of residence required for voting; the disestablishment of the Anglican Church in Wales; the reinstatement of tenants evicted in Ireland during the plan of campaign; tenant right to compensation for improvements in land; eight-hour day for miners (1894); an act for the better protection of children in factories (1895).

Most of these projects had still to pass the House of Commons when the ministry resigned in 1895. The Employers' Liability bill was lost by disagreement between the two Houses. A single legislative reform was carried (through a concession made by Gladstone): the creation of elective parish councils, analogous to the communal councils on the continent. The act of 1894 established in every parish having more than 300 inhabitants a council elected by the rate payers and Parliamentary voters. Neighbouring parishes are allowed to combine and have a single council for the group. The parishes had had from old times the right of managing their own local affairs; but the right was of a semi-ecclesiastical character exercised in the vestry meeting, and only rate payers could take part. The new system admits the ordinary voters to a voice, and the councils are purely lay bodies. In the case of the smaller parishes the act is only permissive, and they have not generally, as yet, chosen to have councils. Some of the most important powers conferred on the parishes by the new law can be exercised only with consent of the county council and the Local Government Board in London.

This last-mentioned fact suggests a profound change which has taken place in the relations between the local authorities and the central government. Formerly the local authorities exercised their functions according to their own judgment. They have now been brought under a somewhat minute supervision. The money at their disposal is largely contributed by the national exchequer. The old autonomy, with its variety of aims and methods, has largely given place to uniformity under administrative dependence on the central power.

The budget, according to English constitutional theory, is under the exclusive control of the House of Commons, at least as regards its details. Financial bills, like other bills, have to pass the House of Lords, but the House of Lords cannot amend them. The Liberal ministry, using its majority in the House of Commons, carried a progressive inheritance tax (death duties). This

was the first time that an English budget had given countenance to such a Radical-Socialist proposal as a progressive tax. It was passed by the House of Lords, without resistance.

In checking the ministerial project of home rule, the House of Lords had resumed in English politics the position of an independent power, which, since the electoral reform of 1832, it seemed to have resigned. For half a century it had given up struggling against the representative House; although many new peers had been created under Victoria, their hall was ordinarily almost empty. What now restored them to power was not that they were lords; but that they appeared as champions of a party popular with the English. The contest between the Liberal majority and the Unionist minority in the Commons assumed the form of a contest between the two Houses.

In 1894 the Liberals, finding their policy blocked by the upper House, began an agitation against the Lords. As a condition of democratic reforms they demanded a constitutional reform, "mending or ending" the Lords. The ultra-Radicals called for abolition of the House of Lords, and government by a single house (the system adopted in several English colonies). The rest of the party would be content with replacing the Lords by an elective assembly, or simply preserving it, but at the same time depriving it of its power to check absolutely every bill passed by the House of Commons. Rosebery declared (1894) that to carry the home rule bill they must first convert England. He then announced the plan of laying before the Commons a resolution against the Lords was begun in the political meetings, but it failed to attract much support and was presently allowed to drop. In the general election of 1895 it was not made a serious issue.

During this struggle socialistic ideas seemed to be gaining ground among workingmen. An independent labour party was organized (January, 1893) to present candidates in opposition to those of the other parties, with a complete doctrinal program. It formulated its purposes thus: an industrial republic based on the socialization of the land and of capital. The trade union congress, meeting at Belfast in September, 1893, voted to raise a fund for paying "labour candidates" and to give them as their program state ownership of the means of production and distribution. The congress of Norwich (1894) passed, by a vote of 219 against 61, a resolution in favour of the nationalization of the soil and of the instruments of production.

The Unionists Return to Power (1895).—The Liberal ministry, deprived of power by resistance of the House of Lords, and but feebly sustained by public opinion in England, had difficulty in holding its small majority in Parliament. The Liberal party was a heterogeneous coalition of old Liberals, Radicals who were half Socialists, Irish Catholics and Protestants Dissenters, both English and Welsh. To satisfy these different divisions, the ministry had adopted a composite program: for the Irish, home rule and compensation for evicted tenants; for the Radical workingmen, the eight-hour day and pay for members of Parliament; for country voters, land reform; for Welsh Dissenters, the disestablishment of the Anglican Church in Wales;* for the English Dissenters, who desired compulsory temperance, the Local Option bill, which would give to each municipality the right to forbid the sale of intoxicating liquors. Each division insisted that its special reform should be attended to first.

The ministry, finding itself in a minority on a military question, owing to the desertion of the Parnellites and some other members, retired in June, 1895. The first act of the succeeding Conservative ministry (the third Salisbury) was to dissolve Parliament.

At the elections of 1895 the Unionist coalition worked together, while the Liberal coalition broke up. The independent Socialist party presented its own candidates, but could not elect one, polling only 30,000 votes in all.†

The Dissenters led a campaign against alcoholic liquors which alienated the liquor dealers of their party. The Unionist coalition secured 411 seats (340 Conservatives, 71 Liberal-Unionists), the Liberal coalition had only 259 seats (177 Liberals or Radicals, 82 Irish). The Liberal-Unionists regained most of the seats they had lost in 1892.

England gave the Tories and Liberal-Unionists 349 seats against 116; and in the other divisions of Great Britain the Liberals had a majority of only 40—6 from Scotland, 34 from Wales.

The Conservatives had a majority of their own, without counting in their Liberal-Unionist allies. But the alliance had become

* Wales, where the old Celtic language is more fully preserved than in Ireland, had revived in the nineteenth century a spirit of Welsh nationality, based on language. The great majority of the people are Protestant Dissenters.

† At the trade union congress of 1895, at Cardiff, the Socialists were in a minority.

so close that the ministry remained composed of men of both divisions. The former Radical leader, Chamberlain, now leader of the Liberal-Unionists in the Commons, had become the government's man of action. From his earliest days he has retained the leaning toward improvements in the material condition of the labouring and peasant classes. The Conservative ministry, following out party traditions, has occupied itself with foreign policy, and with social and industrial rather than political reforms at home. It has carried an act for giving workmen compensation in case of accident, also an act granting public aid to the "Voluntary Schools," which are maintained by the churches and are still attended by a greater number of pupils than the public schools. It has also extended the elective county councils to Ireland.

Political Evolution of England in the Nineteenth Century.—England is the only state in Europe which has gone through the nineteenth century without a revolution. She has preserved intact her traditional constitution and even the mechanism of her government. Outsiders, forgetting the revolutions of the seventeenth century, conclude from this that political stability is inherent in the English character.

Yet, beneath this firmly established mechanism, the practical side of politics has undergone such a profound change, from the beginning to the end of the century, that England has finally emerged from her old *régime*. In 1814 the nation was still under an aristocracy which had the legal control of society, local administration, and central government. The nineteenth century has renovated the constitution of society by establishing the principle of equality before the law. Laws and customs have been abolished which formerly sanctioned legal inequality, disabilities of Dissenters, Catholics, and Jews, impressment of sailors, brutal usage of paupers, prohibition of associations among workingmen. Local administration has been taken away from the local aristocracy and given to councils elected by the people. The central government has preserved its forms, but the transformation of the electing bodies has given it a new direction; the House of Commons, formerly an aristocratic legislative body, has become an assembly of representatives of the nation. It has little by little shut out from the government the King and the Lords, until it has become a virtually supreme authority, at least when it represents English opinion. It has made the ministry, which should be the Queen's chosen advisers, its own executive committee. England has thus passed from an aristocratic to a democratic

system, and her democratic system is developing toward a republic governed by an assembly chosen by popular vote.

This evolution of society and government in a democratic sense was so contradictory to the aristocratic constitution of English society that for a long time it remained unperceived. And it really was not produced by an internal evolution of English society, it was imposed from the outside. The change can only be explained by the incongruous composition of the English state.

The United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, which we improperly speak of as England, is not, like France, a real nation; it is a mixture of ancient peoples (English, Welsh, Scotch, and Irish), united in government, but distinct in social organization and religion. One may count as still another nation the industrial society born since the end of the eighteenth century in the desert regions of the north and west of England.

The "old England," the England of the south and east, that England which had organized the government and the Church, was aristocratic and Anglican, and is still; docile under the hands of its nobility and clergy, it has remained the mainstay of the Conservatives. But the other nations of the Kingdom are attached neither to the aristocracy nor to the Anglican Church; Scotland is democratic and Presbyterian, Ireland Catholic and hostile to the English landlords, Wales and the new industrial England of the north and west are largely made up of Dissenters. These democratic societies and Dissenters are naturally opposed to a system which excluded them from political power and treats their religion as inferior. It is they who have recruited the opposition parties against the English nobility and the Anglican Church. It is the Irish, the Scotch, the Welsh, the English of the north and west, who have formed and who still form the mass of the Liberal and Radical parties. It is they who have brought a democratic evolution upon "old England."

But "old England," in possession of the government and the court, has used its position to maintain its old system and its supremacy over its subjects in the three kingdoms; and by resisting innovations up to the limit of patience of its subjects, it has succeeded in greatly checking the evolution toward democracy.* This explains why the transformation in English institu-

*The evolution toward democracy has taken place in all the English colonies; it has been more rapid and more complete there than in England.

tions has been so slow in proportion to the enormous forces set in motion by the opposition.

In no other European country was the influence of the democratic party spread so quickly. It was in England that the political program of the democratic parties of Europe was formulated for the first time in the nineteenth century (by the Radicals in 1819). No other democratic party has attracted the masses in such numbers as the Radicals, the Chartists, the Irish under O'Connell, and the strikers of 1866; England has been the country of gigantic agitations and demonstrations. But these democratic masses, having respect for the law, yielded before the resistance of the aristocratic government which, with force at its command, easily held them in check by arrests, coercive laws, and employment of troops. They have, with agitation, accomplished less in a half-century than a handful of French republicans, with a decisive blow, accomplished in a single day. Further, in order to force the Conservative aristocracy to yield, they have been obliged to join themselves with, and place themselves under, the Liberal aristocracy. They have had to content themselves with the partial reforms which their allies consented to propose. In this manner they have established, under the form of compromise, a suffrage almost universal—quasi-obligation of primary education, quasi-equality of classes in Ireland, quasi-elective local administration, and quasi-democratic industrial legislation.

In all these reforms the Liberal "general staff" has led; the democratic masses of workingmen and Irishmen gave at the start the impelling force to set the movement on foot; and when, later, the crisis of the reform arrived, they insured its passage by overawing the Conservative rulers by means of imposing demonstrations. The old Radicals demanded complete electoral reform, and succeeded in extorting the partial reforms of 1832 and 1867, each followed by a series of reforms both democratic and independent of the Church. The Irish claimed and obtained political equality of creeds.

After having acquired, by the right of voting, a part in political power, the Radicals and the Irish have slowly won places for themselves in the English Liberal party and have finally won it over to their program of home rule and democratic reforms, until it has become difficult to distinguish a Liberal from a Radical or a member of the Irish party. The Conservative party has

so far yielded to the infusion of the Radical-Unionists that it now takes the initiative in democratic measures.

Thus the old system, defended by the privileged English minority, was destroyed by the attack of the non-English majority; but the work was done bit by bit. The new system has been established in the same fashion, without a general plan, preserving the Royal House and the hereditary peers, the privileged Church established by law, the unsalaried elective officers, the restrictions on the right of voting. The remains of ancient institutions have mingled with the foundations of the new in a contradictory whole, where it is impossible to decide what will survive and what will disappear. This is the cause of the confused character of modern English politics.

BIBLIOGRAPHY.

SOURCES.—See bibliog. of chapters ii. and iii.

To the reviews, already mentioned add: *National Review*, *Fortnightly Review*, *Nineteenth Century*, *Contemporary Review*, *Free Review*; all the articles are noted in **Poole's** Index.

The reviews, the London *Times*, the "Annual Register," **Hansard's** "Debates," and the Parliamentary documents are the principal sources for this period.

WORKS.—ON THE GENERAL HISTORY.—**McCarthy**, "Hist. of our Own Times from 1880 to the Queen's Jubilee," 1897, continues the modern history by the same author.

ON ELECTORAL REFORM.—**Franqueville** (see bibliog. of chap. ii.).

Heaton, "Three Reforms of Parliament."—**Dickinson**, "Development of Parliament in the Nineteenth Century."

ON MODERN ENGLISH INSTITUTIONS.—"The English Citizen," 1881-91, collection of monographs by different authors, for the most part very clear and accurate: **Traill** (Central Government), **Walpole** (Electorate and Legislature), **Wilson** (Finance), **Chalmers** (Local Administration), **Maitland** (Justice and Police), **Elliot** (State and Church), **Fowle** (Poor Law), **Jevons** (Labor Legislation), **Farrer** (Trade), and **Craik** (Education).—**Anson**, "Law and Custom of the Constitution," 2 vols., 1890, a clear and methodical description (vol. i. Parliament, ii. Crown).

ON THE QUESTION OF OBSTRUCTION.—**Reynaert**, "Hist. de la Discipline Parlementaire," 2 vols., 1884.

ON DISRAELI'S POLICY.—**Brandes**, "Lord Beaconsfield," German trans., 1879.—**Cucheval-Clarigny**, "Lord Beaconsfield et son Temps," 1880.—**Kehbel**, "Hist. of Toryism," 1886.—**Froude**, "Beaconsfield."—**Lucy**, "Diaries" of the Parliaments since 1874.

ON IRELAND.—See in the "National Biography" the bibliog. under the article on Parnell.—**King**, "Irish Question."—**Walsh**, "Irish Land Acts."—**Richey**, "Land Law of Ireland."

ON THE SOCIALIST PARTIES.—Besides **S. Webb**, "Hist. of Trade-Unionism," see two bibliog. published by socialist groups : I. Fabian Society, "What to Read," 1893 ; II. Clarion, "Catal. of Books on Socialism," 1895, which give the list of publications by the socialist societies. In French, **de Rousiers**, "Le Trade-Unionism en Angleterre," 1897.

FRANCE.

CHAPTER V.

THE MONARCHY OF THE PROPERTY CLASS.

The Bourbon Restoration.—After the decisive defeat of Napoleon and the capitulation of Paris, there was no longer any government for France; the Allies undertook to provide her with one. They wished neither another republic nor another Napoleon. Three solutions were proposed: * 1st, Napoleon's son (the King of Rome), under the regency of his mother, Arch-Duchess Marie Louise, daughter of the Austrian Emperor; 2d, a French general (the Tsar was thinking of Bernadotte); 3d, the old royal family of France, the Bourbons. The King of Rome was dropped from the question, as the choice of him would have given Austria too much influence; the idea of a French general was a personal whim of Alexander's, the other Allies would not hear of it. The Bourbons alone were left, and Alexander alone objected to them. In the interview at Langres with Metternich (January, 1814) he proposed to call upon the electoral assemblies of France to send deputies who should decide the nation's destiny, while the armies of the Allies kept down agitators. Metternich refused to listen to any "experiment with the principle of sovereignty of the people." "It would be," he said, "a new edition of the Convention, a new breaking forth of the Revolution. . . Besides, what question is this assembly to decide? The legitimate King is there."

The Tsar finally agreed to the Bourbons. The difficulty was to reconcile the French nation. The English government had introduced the principle that the Allies should await the restoration of the monarchy by the French nation itself, that they might not appear to have concerned themselves directly with the internal affairs of France; they would treat with the government recognised by the French. Now the Allies had been struck on their march through France with the absence of any mention of

*The discussion began at the camp of Bâle in January, 1814, between Metternich and Castlereagh, the Tsar being absent.

the name of Bourbon: the new generation fostered by the Revolution and the Empire no longer recognised the family. Metternich wrote in March: "The invasion has shown in the great majority of the French people only an unexampled lack of interest. . . The French people will never take the initiative on the Bourbon question, the principles avowed by the Allies forbid them to take it. The Bourbon princes must take the matter into their own hands." The next step was to incite a demonstration in favour of the Bourbons. It was Talleyrand who organized it. He was in Paris, a member of the regency established by Napoleon during his absence; he sent to the camp of the Allies a royalist, de Vitrolles; the Count of Artois had sent another. The Allies decided (March 20) to promise their support to the Bourbon party if it declared itself publicly: they would allow Monsieur (Charles, Count of Artois) to establish himself in the invaded provinces, and place under the management of his partisans all those districts which declared themselves loyal to him, guaranteeing them impunity in any case. But while supporting the Bourbons, the Allies gave them prudent advice: the English government engaged Louis XVIII. not to show himself in France, Metternich advised Monsieur not to bestow any office on an *émigré*.

When, on the 31st of March, 1814, the Allies entered Paris, they were in harmony with one another. The prefects had posted an announcement that the Tsar would take Paris under his protection; the Austrian general, that "The sovereign powers are seeking a worthy authority for France which should succeed in establishing peace among all nations. To Paris the opportunity has now come to hasten the restoration of peace to the world. Only let her announce her plan, and the army before the walls of the city will sustain the decision." In the morning some royalist gentlemen, upon showing themselves with white cockades, were received with cries of "Long live the Emperor!" The placards restored their courage; they went through the streets with handkerchiefs tied to their canes, crying "Long live the King!" Then, when the sovereign powers made their formal entry (by the gate of Saint Martin), the royalists marched alongside of the Tsar, crying "Long live Alexander! Long live the Bourbons!"

That evening a discussion took place at Talleyrand's house; there were eight present: the Tsar and his two councillors, the King of Prussia, two Austrians (Schwarzenberg and Lichtenstein), and two great Napoleonic dignitaries, Dalberg and Talley-

rand. The Allies again brought up the objection that France did not want the Bourbons. Talleyrand undertook to secure their call to the throne by official authority, and drew up the declaration of the sovereign powers: "They will no longer treat with Napoleon Bonaparte nor any member of his family; they will respect ancient France as she was under her lawful kings; they will recognise and guarantee the constitution which the French nation gives itself. They invite the Senate to appoint a provisional government which shall take the administrative duties upon itself and prepare a constitution."

The Senate appointed a provisional government of five members and drew up a constitution maintaining all the imperial institutions, or, more exactly, all the personal situations acquired under Napoleon. It guaranteed to the Senate and the Legislative Body their continuance as an essential part of the constitution; to the army its appropriation, its grades and distinctions; to state creditors the recognition of their claims; to purchasers of national estates unimpeachable ownership. They promised liberty of creed and liberty of the press, liberty to express political opinion. Thus the Empire was suppressed by the bodies established during the imperial *régime*, or rather by the minorities of those bodies: the Senate by 62 members out of 142, the House by 77 out of 303, declared Napoleon dethroned, "the right of hereditary established for his family" abolished, the people and the army absolved from their oath of allegiance. Napoleon, following the advice of his marshals, abdicated at Fontainebleau.

Then the Senate alone decreed: "The French people of their own free will summon to the throne Louis of France, brother of the late King," and added that the senators would retain their office (April 6). The Allies could then treat with the French government. First they arranged with the Count of Artois an armistice to recall the French troops scattered about in fortresses outside of France (April 23), then the treaty of peace with Louis XVIII. (May 30). The Allies had been very moderate; they left to France her territory of 1792 with some extensions, renounced all indemnity, refused to allow Prussia's claim for supplies to Napoleon's army, "in order to show their desire to efface all traces of that unfortunate period." They did not even reclaim the works of art seized by Napoleon and placed in French museums.

They waited until Louis XVIII. had published the Charter guaranteeing to France a liberal monarchy, then they, with their armies, left the country.

Political Institutions under the Charter.—The Allies had demanded for France a constitutional system. The Count of Artois had published a declaration which made no mention of guarantees. Metternich himself demanded that the King should bind himself to govern under constitutional forms. Louis XVIII. arrived in France, refused to swear fidelity to the constitution drawn up by the Senate; but at least, by the declaration of Saint Ouen (May 2), he formulated the principles on which he meant to found the liberal constitution he promised to propose to the Senate and Legislative Body: representative government with two bodies, the Senate and the House, controlling taxation; responsible ministers; permanent judges; liberty of creed, press, and person; guarantee of ranks, of the national debt, of the revolutionary land titles, and of the Legion of Honour; civil-service positions to be open to all Frenchmen.

The Constitutional Charter (June, 1814) organized the monarchy. The restoration of royalty was not at all a re-establishment of the old *régime*. France preserved the social organization created by the Revolution and the administrative organization established by Napoleon.

The Revolution had created a society founded on legal equality, without official recognition of classes, without an established church, without legal privileges—a society where no social advantage is hereditary except property, and where property itself is divided between a great number of inhabitants. The Empire had organized a body of professional officials, divided into sharply defined services (army, clergy, magistracy, administration, direct and indirect tax services, bridges and roads, University), all strongly centralized under the supervision of all-powerful ministers established at Paris; recruited without distinctions of birth by a sort of coaptation, practically permanent, and full of a strong fellow-feeling, controlling the whole country with uniform regulations. The nation in 1814 was already provided with its social and administrative organization; it remained—as it still remains—a democratic society whose affairs are managed by a centralized administration. The mechanism of the central government was not, however, yet constructed; France has laboured to establish it; she has spent the nineteenth century in making herself a political constitution.

Louis XVIII. preserved all the institutions of the Empire, magistracy, codes, administration, Church, University, Legion of Honour, banking, even the imperial nobility. He abolished only

conscription and the combined taxes which had made Napoleon unpopular (these were soon replaced by enlistment and indirect taxes). Nothing remained for him to do but to organize the sovereign government. Alexander and the English advised him to adopt a representative system; the Senate demanded it; Benjamin Constant contrasted it with Napoleon's despotism; Louis XVIII. accepted it. As the English constitution was once more the fashion, France copied England, where the constitutional monarchy had been in operation for more than a century, and transplanted all the English political mechanism. The government was divided between three powers: the King; the Chamber of Peers chosen by the King, and hereditary like the English Lords; the Chamber of Deputies elected, like the English Commons, by property owners. As in England, the lower houses had the primary control of the budget; laws must be passed by both houses; the ministers could be impeached by the Deputies and tried by the Peers; members of neither house were to receive pay. As in England, the King had power to choose his ministers, sanction laws, convoke, adjourn, and dissolve the elected house; and the ministers were responsible, that is to say, the houses could call them to account for their political acts. The Chambers must meet every year, every act of the King must be countersigned by a minister, the press should be free; these were the English guarantees against despotism. They introduced even some English customs: the speech from the throne at the opening of the session, the address from the Chamber in reply. As in England, institutions were established with a permanent character; no provision was made for revision.

This system left three political questions to be solved:

First. What should be the relations between the King and the elected Chamber? The question had not yet been settled beyond possibility of doubt even in England (see p. 12). Could the King choose any ministers he wished, according to the old Tory theory? or should he take them from the majority, according to the Whig theory? This was the leading question; in a country administered exclusively by appointed officials and provided with an irresistible standing army, the real power is the executive power, which controls the functionaries and the army. He who controls the ministers is the really supreme authority.

Second. How should the electoral body be composed? The Charter fixed the amount of tax demanded as a qualification for voting (300 francs), but did not regulate the manner of election.

Third. How should the liberty of the press be regulated?

These last two questions were to be settled by laws which, not being incorporated in the constitution, would always be open to change.

Power to choose the ministers, electoral system, press laws, were the three grounds on which the parties were destined to contend and political life was to centre all through the Restoration.

Conditions of Political Life.—In order to understand this history, we must look at the conditions of French life at this period. This requires an effort of attention, as our current terms (electors, chambers, newspapers) expressed entirely different meanings at that time, so much has society changed since 1814.

Economic life in France had been checked by the imperial wars, which had isolated the French people and forced them to do without the products of English industry. An industrial aristocracy had sprung up, made up of masters of ironworks and of thread and cloth factories in the east and in Normandy, who wished both then and now to monopolize the French market. The land aristocracy of great proprietors tried to maintain the high price of wheat. As these two aristocracies together controlled the two Chambers, they kept the frontier closed by a system of customs duties which perpetuated the continental blockade. The sliding scale for grain allowed the importation of wheat only when burdened with a duty which rose as the price fell, in such fashion as to assure the French producers a minimum price. This was an imitation of the English corn laws. The protective tariff on iron and on cloth was prohibitive, firmly reserving the market to French industry. The timid attempts made by the government to open France to foreign commerce will only succeed, up to 1860, in lowering some articles of the tariff.

The workingmen, since the system established by the Constituante, had no longer the right to associate for the purpose of settling the terms of labour; the penal code made strikes and even coalitions punishable by imprisonment. Labourers were therefore obliged to remain isolated without other tie than the remains of the old journeyman societies preserved in several trades, subject, without defence, to the will of the employers, and kept under watch by means of the *livret*.* They were ignorant and dependent, without any share in political life; and yet it was they

* A sort of pass-book carried by labourers showing where and by whom they had been employed.

who furnished enthusiasts and fanatics to recruit the secret societies and stir up riots. In the country the tenant farmers and métayers, who formed a large part of the population, especially in the western and central parts, were dependent on the large landowners. Thus, in spite of legal equality, French society was still divided into classes, a titled and untitled aristocracy of great proprietors and great manufacturers, a middle class of petty property owners and functionaries, a poor and dependent class of day labourers.

The middle class still led a simple, quiet life, the life of the small town—monotonous, without comforts, without amusements, without intellectual activity, a slave to public opinion. Communication was still very difficult. There were nothing but old roads, badly laid out; ill-kept, paved roads broken up by heavy teaming (macadamizing did not begin until Louis Philippe's reign). Railroads were not generally introduced until 1848; travellers were still at the mercy of stage-coaches. Coaches which were thought to be very quick took three days to go between Paris and Lyons. The postal system was still based on the principle of postage paid by the receiver; the price was high; in 1829 there were still only 1300 post offices, and except in the cities there was no carrier to deliver the letters.

The long wars had almost suspended all intellectual life; the tradition was preserved by some survivors of the eighteenth century (the ideologues), but the new generation had received no regular instruction. An intellectual restoration set in, and people began once more to study and to teach. The Faculties were still organized as special schools (called the Law School, the Medical School); the students were few, but the public, eager for instruction, went to the public courses, read historical works, and exalted to the rank of great *savants* their professors and popularizers (Cousin, Villemain, Guizot, Aug. Thierry, de Barante). Literature, in which, except for Chateaubriand and Béranger, there remained hardly any but strangers (Mme. de Staël, Benj. Constant, the de Maistres), renewed itself by imitating foreign literature. Secondary education, left subject to the monopoly of the University, was shared among the state colleges* and the little Church seminaries, which combined the boarding school and the monastery, with division into classes and uniform studies, the dead languages and mathematics—that is to say, the educational

* The imperial name *lycée* was during the monarchy replaced by the old name of *collège*.

system of the Jesuits. Primary education was much neglected, encouraged neither by the government nor the middle class; in 1821 there were 25,000 communes without schools, and the appropriation was but 50,000 francs; and the Right wished to put a stop to it altogether. It was only after the law passed in 1833 that the French began to organize primary schools. The great majority of the French could not read; intellectual life could hardly be said to exist among the people.

Religion had been disorganized; the clergy, few in number, had lost a great part of their influence, the middle class rarely attended church, there were almost no religious publications. In the Protestant Church religious exercises, suspended by a century of persecution, had recovered themselves only superficially. The religious restoration of the Catholic Church was directed first by the Congregation, a private society founded in 1816; then by the Jesuit houses, and after 1830 by the Catholic Liberal party (Lamennais, Montalembert, Lacordaire), who succeeded in making religion the fashion again. In the Protestant Church a similar restoration, the awakening (*réveil*), was brought about by the action of foreign Protestants. But almost until 1840 religious activity was too feeble to have any influence on political life.

The dominant characteristic of the political life of this period was that it was limited to a very small portion of the nation. All manual labourers, artisans, peasants, small tradesmen, almost all lower officials, all the lower clergy, a great part of the middle class were excluded. The right of voting seemed such a dangerous power that they did not dare to intrust it to more than a small number of the French; universal suffrage recalled the Convention and Napoleon's plebiscites. There was no hesitation about adopting the evidence of property furnished by the taxes as a basis of the right of voting. The Charter fixed a qualification so high that it gave the whole system a plutocratic character. The nation was divided into two classes, the great majority deprived of all political right, the small privileged minority of voters (until 1830, with the qualification at 300 francs, between 88,000 and 110,000; after 1830, with the qualification at 200 francs, between 166,000 and 241,000). These voters, veritable political grandees, met together at the chief town and formed an electoral college (like the French colleges of senatorial electors at present). In this they voted with written ballots.

The political press had the same character of plutocratic privilege. Political journals had to make a heavy deposit with the

government (ordinarily 200,000 francs) as security for their good conduct; also to pay a stamp tax of 10 centimes (2 cents) a copy, a postage duty of 5 centimes. Papers were not sold by the single copy, but to subscribers only and at a high price, each copy being burdened with a tax of 15 centimes. A subscription was a luxury reserved to the middle class, several of whom often united to pay the expense. There were very few newspapers, three or four to each party; and their circulation, till about 1830, did not exceed 15,000. A secret report in 1824 estimated the total number of copies of political papers at 41,000 for the opposition, 15,000 for the government. In 1830 the 23,000 subscriptions to the *Constitutionnel* were considered a great success. These papers contained only political and literary articles, anonymous like those in England. French people regarded it as nothing less than revolutionary when the *Presse*, in 1836, published articles on various subjects, and there was a great scandal when the *Presse*, to cover expenses, inserted paid advertisements. The Restoration papers, expensive, empty, and monotonous, bore no resemblance to the press of to-day. But they had, few as they were, supreme influence over their subscribers; each man, reading only one paper, had only that paper's opinion.

On the other hand the government, with a susceptibility which we cannot realize, supervised the press; every opposition article which could be suspected of offensive intention was referred to the courts. In 1818, under a Liberal ministry, the authors of the "Historical Library" were condemned to six months' imprisonment because "under pretext of gathering material for a history of the time, they selected and introduced into their compilation acts which had a constant tendency, through accompanying notes, observations, and qualifications, to cast disfavour upon the government . . . thereby denoting constant and deliberate ill will." The law of 1819, the most liberal law passed under the Restoration, still recognised as a misdemeanour any remark against the person of the King, and prosecuted for such offence an author who spoke of the Swiss guards as satellites and janissaries.

The Hundred Days and the Second Restoration.—After the return of Louis XVIII. it was thought that France had entered upon political calm. The King had kept the imperial officials and even Napoleon's ministers (Talleyrand, Fouché, Baron Louis). The majority of the peers were former senators of the Empire. There had been no elections; the members of the

Chamber were still those that had assembled in 1814 to discuss the project. Louis XVIII. seemed to have accepted sincerely the society founded by the Revolution, and that society, rejoicing at the end of war, welcomed the Bourbons, "the uncontested family" (Benj. Constant). To mark this reconciliation, Beugnot had made an historic remark concerning the return of the Count of Artois: "Nothing is changed in France, there is simply one more Frenchman." There was no division into political parties; the Chamber was occupied only with finance.

This harmony could not last. The King, his brother, his personal associates, without any important political act, offended or disturbed French society by the use of obsolete forms. The King called himself Louis XVIII. and called his first year on the throne the eighteenth year of his reign, as if to show that he did not recognise the legitimacy of the governments preceding him. He called himself King *by the grace of God*, without mentioning the will of the nation; he called the constitution by an old name revived from the Middle Ages, the "*Charte Constitutionnelle*," and promulgated it with the formula "we concede and grant," like a charter really granted, to which the nation had no right. He re-established the red musketeers and the body guards. The imperial nobility was treated at court with less respect than was paid to the ancient nobility. The Count of Artois, living in the pavilion of Marsan, surrounded himself with *émigrés*, who spoke of taking possession of their confiscated property again. This circle, nicknamed the *Entresol* Ministry, was suspected of having influence over the government. In the country the Sunday processions and compulsory rest were restored. All these measures, unimportant in themselves, were nevertheless symbolic and gave the middle class the belief that the court wished to re-establish the old *régime*. The change of flag confirmed this impression. The tricolour flag was that of the army, the white flag that of the *émigrés*; Count Artois had entered Paris with an escort wearing the two cockades. But the King had definitely decided in favour of the white. This change humiliated the army like a symbol of defeat. The officers, recalled from countries occupied by French garrisons, were too numerous for the army in time of peace; as there was no employment for them they were dismissed on half-pay. For minister of war the King chose an unpopular general, Dupont, the man that had capitulated at Baylen.

By these measures the government had irritated the army. An imperialist party was organized, principally among army officers.

Napoleon's minister of police, Fouché, made secret arrangements with several generals for the return of the Emperor. Napoleon, informed of this by a messenger, arrived in France. Avoiding the Rhône valley, which the royalists controlled, he passed through the mountains of Dauphiné and came to Lyons. The whole army at once joined him and resumed the tricolour flag; the Bourbons, finding themselves deserted, fled to Belgium. Napoleon, to keep his hold, was willing to conciliate the Liberals and even the Republicans. He asked Benjamin Constant to draw up a liberal constitution; he promulgated it under the title of the "Act Added to the Constitutions of the Empire," and even had it ratified by universal suffrage, inviting every citizen to sign his name in registers provided for this special purpose. One million five hundred thousand votes were polled. The new constitution established the same *régime* as the Charter, but it was never applied. France's fate was to be determined by war. The Allies refused to recognise Napoleon; their armies united once more. The Waterloo campaign settled the downfall of the Empire and the return of the Bourbons. Napoleon abdicated, proclaiming his son, Napoleon II., *Emperor of the French*. The Legislative Chambers, however, formed a provisional government of five members, which refused to recognise Napoleon II., and governed *in the name of the French nation*; then the Allies arrived, bringing back Louis XVIII. and the white cockade.

Results of the Hundred Days.—The episode of the Hundred days was simply a military revolt, a *pronunciamiento* of the army of Napoleon. But in causing renewed interference from the Allies it produced incalculable results:

First. There was, to begin with, the invasion, followed this time by a long occupation. The Allies, now much irritated against the French, did not treat them as in 1814; they demanded a war indemnity of 700,000,000, payable in 5 years, and the support of an army of occupation of 150,000 men for a period of 3 to 5 years.

Second. There was a new and less advantageous division of territory. The treaty of 1815 took away from France, in addition to Savoy, certain strips of her territory of 1790, in all half a million of inhabitants. Again the Tsar and England were obliged to oppose the dismemberment demanded by Prussia, Austria, and the German princes.

Third. There was at last a profound change in national and

political sentiments in France and in Europe. The invasion of 1814, short and skilfully managed, had left no lasting ill feeling; the Allies had made war simply against Napoleon; they had respected France's internal independence and her ancient territory. Napoleon's return angered Europe against France. The Allies, irritated because the French had so readily abandoned their legitimate King, were convinced that Europe, in the interests of peace, must keep supervision over such an incorrigibly revolutionary people; they determined to interfere in France's domestic affairs, informing themselves of the state of the different parties, threatening the French government, and arranging between themselves to prepare armed interference in case of internal revolution (secret treaty of November, 1815). This defiant attitude of the European powers against France became a national feeling, at least among the Germans.

Fourth. On their part the French, directly affected by the prolonged invasion, and mortified by the mutilation of their territory, regarded the conduct of the Allies in 1815 as an insult and an abuse of power; patriotism consisted henceforth in demanding a new war to efface the disgrace of the treaties of 1815. The patriots also resented France's dependent position toward foreign powers, in having to submit to interference in home affairs; this sentiment was expressed in hatred of the coalition improperly termed the Holy Alliance, and it became the custom for the French to represent themselves as hostile to all Europe.

Fifth. There was a new division of parties; France was separated into two factions: those who had sided with Napoleon and the tricolour flag and those who had remained faithful to the Bourbons and the white flag. On each side was a coalition without real political unity. The tricolour party were imperialist Republicans; the Republicans, joined to the old soldiers, ceased to regard Napoleon as a tyrant; this was the beginning of the legendary Napoleon, the patriotic ruler of France, pursued by the hatred of the Allies because he loved France too well, who came back in 1815 to defend the conquests of the Revolution against the men of the old *régime*. The Revolution and the Empire became one. This confusion is shown in the writings of the time—P.-L. Courier, Casimir Delavigne, and especially the Republican Béranger, Napoleon's old enemy, now the poet who sang of imperial glory; there are traces of it in historical works (Thiers, Vaulabelle). The party was made up chiefly of the Emperor's

officers and old admirers, of Liberal middle-class people and patriots, and workingmen in the large cities. It was a military and patriotic party; it appealed to the hatred of foreigners and to national honour; it reproached the Bourbons with having been "brought back in the enemies' baggage," with being foreign *protégés*, with being in league with the "Holy Alliance," "murderers of the people." It was a democratic and a lay party, which appealed to the hatred of the old *régime* and accused the Bourbons of wishing to restore tithes, forced labour (*corvées*), and feudal rights, privileges of the nobility, the Inquisition, and *lettres de cachet*.

Similarly the White Cockade party was not made up solely of advocates of the Charter and of the constitutional monarchy. The violent Royalists were no longer content with the partial restoration of 1814; they wanted social restoration, a counter-revolution, to destroy the work of the Revolution without being agreed on the extent to which they wanted the old *régime* restored. They attacked especially the retention of the confiscated estates, and the Concordat. The Royalists, "more royalist than the King," nicknamed the *Ultras*, were made up of *émigrés* and country gentry chiefly from the western part of the country; they regarded as their leader not the King, but the King's brother, the future Charles X.

From now on France was divided into irreconcilable factions. It was not, as in England, simply a party struggle for the general control of the government and the interpretation of the constitution. There were two revolutionary parties which did not recognise the constitution: the *Ultras*, similar to the English Jacobites in the eighteenth century, hating the charter because it sanctioned the Revolution; the Liberals (the Imperialist-Republican coalition, a party without English parallel), rejecting the monarchy because the monarchy rejected the national flag and submitted to foreign supervision.

The Counter-Revolutionary Crisis (1815-16).—The invasion of 1815 gave the power first to the Counter-Revolutionary party. The Royalists, sustained by the presence of the allied armies, avenged themselves for the defections of the Hundred Days. Their revenge took two forms: political prosecutions and, in the south, massacres. The amnesty granted to "Misled Frenchmen" did not extend to acts committed prior to March 23. The superior officers accused of having aided Napoleon's return were tried by court-martial (Ney before the Court of Peers); many

were condemned and shot. Then the *Provost Courts* were established (December 20, 1815), formed of five judges presided over by a military officer, for the summary judgment of every individual accused of seditious acts or cries. The Legislative Houses passed laws giving the government the right to detain without trial every man accused of conspiracy, and decreed the penalty of penal servitude for seditious writings or speeches. They voted an amnesty from which they excluded all high officials of the Hundred Days and all *regicides*, that is to say, the deputies to the convention which had decreed the death of Louis XVI.

In the south, the Royalists of some of the cities massacred generals and prisoners, maltreated Hundred Days officials, purchasers of confiscated estates, Liberals, and even women; at Nîmes, where the Protestants had sympathized with the Emperor, violence took the form of religious persecution. This mass of executions, massacres, and disorders, known as the *White Terror*, brought the climax of party hatred.

The Chamber of Deputies, enlarged to 402 members (by a legislative decree), was elected in August, 1815, under the influence of the invasion and of the Terror. The election was conducted under the electoral system of the Empire, by electoral colleges of arrondissements and departments made up of electors chosen for life. The arrondissement colleges proposed candidates from among whom the department colleges made their choice; but the prefects had had the right to add to the list of electors ten names for each arrondissement, twenty for each department, and many Imperialist voters had not dared to take part in the election. The tricolour party was hardly represented. The Chamber of Deputies was composed of a great majority of *Ultras* and a minority of Royalists, supporters of the Charter and the ministry. The King, satisfied at first with this unexpected Royalist unanimity, called it the *Chambre Introuvable*—the unfindable chamber.

This harmony between the King and the Chamber lasted until the question arose, What measures shall be taken against the enemies of royalty? The Chamber passed exceptional laws (seditious writings, provost courts, exceptions to amnesty). They abolished divorce without debate as a "disgrace to the Code." They also proposed to abolish some of the institutions guaranteed by the Charter, the University, the national debt, permanent justices, and even demanded the restitution of the confiscated es-

tates. But these attempts at restoration were checked by the peers, old imperial officials and natural protectors of the *régime* established by the Charter. Then the Chamber entered upon a conflict with the King over the question of their respective powers and over the electoral laws.

Louis XVIII. had dismissed his Imperialist ministers (Fouché, Talleyrand), but had replaced almost all of them with Royalists of the constitutional party in minority in the House, and had given the presidency to the Duke of Richelieu, a personal friend of Alexander I.; he thus assured to France the protection of the Tsar and facilitated negotiations for the payment of the war indemnity and the evacuation of territory. Only three ministers belonged to the *Ultras*, the party having the majority in the House. They were friends of the Count of Artois and they were accused of forming with him a secret council at Marsan pavilion. Their colleagues held aloof from them. The majority of the deputies protested against this ministry, which did not possess their confidence, and demanded a ministry of the majority, after the Parliamentary plan. The King claimed his right to free choice of ministers, and the minority of constitutional Liberals sustained him against the majority. The orator of the party, Royer-Collard, thus clearly defined the theory of royal supremacy: "If the day should come when the government were in the hands of the majority in the Chambers, and when that majority had the power to dismiss the King's ministers, then would come the fall, not only of the Constitution, but of independent royalty; then we should have a republic" (1816).

At this time were formulated the two opposing doctrines which reappeared under Louis Philippe under the name of *constitutional monarchy* and *parliamentary government*. The constitutional doctrine recognised the King's right to choose his ministers as he liked, even contrary to the wish of the Deputies, so long as he did not govern contrary to the constitution; the King was acknowledged head of the executive power, the only real power, and consequently master of the nation; the legislature had over him no other influence than the illusive right to impeach the ministers for violation of the constitution. The Parliamentary doctrine declared the King obliged to choose ministers from the majority; the executive power was to be under the rule of the Parliament, which by a vote of want of confidence could compel the ministry to retire. The sovereignty was, in this view, indirectly transferred to the Chamber of Deputies. In 1816 the Ul-

tras upheld the doctrine of Parliamentary rights against the King, and the Liberals defended the royal prerogatives against the Royalists.

On the election question, the Ultras demanded election in two degrees, by canton and department, and for the cantonal voters the lowering of the qualification to 50 francs of direct tax, which would mean the extension of suffrage to nearly 2,000,000 voters. They demanded also a large House and the complete renovation of the Chamber every five years. The King and the Liberal minority wished to preserve the system of direct election with a small body of voters (less than 100,000), demanding for qualification 300 francs in taxes; they demanded partial renovation and reduction in the number of deputies. The electoral law proposed by the Ultras was passed by the Deputies and rejected by the Peers (March-April, 1816).

The Ultras wished also to diminish the power of the prefects and to give the local administration into the hands of the landowners. The Liberals defended the centralization established by the Empire.

The rôles of the parties seemed reversed; it was the old *régime* party that wished to weaken the King that the Parliament might profit; also to enlarge the electoral body, and increase local autonomy. It was the Liberal party that sustained royal supremacy, the power of the prefects, and a limited suffrage. The parties regarded political mechanism simply as an instrument to secure for themselves the control of the government, and cared less for the form of government than for the direction given to public policy. The Ultras, aiming to establish an aristocratic system, wished to place the power in the hands of the country nobles, who would have had control of the Chamber, thanks to the 50-franc electors. The Liberals sought to preserve the supremacy of the King, the prefects, and the 300-franc electors, because they were known to favour the maintenance of the social *régime* founded by the Revolution.

Louis XVIII., supported by foreign powers, kept his ministry and resisted the Deputies; he began by closing the session (April, 1816) and, without convoking it again, finally dissolved it (September, 1816).

The order for the dissolution re-established for the next Chamber the number of 258 deputies, as in 1814. The King, by a simple ordinance, changed the composition of the House; it was a *coup d'état* like that of 1830. To secure the House of Peers the

King created new peers, naming former generals and officials under the Empire.

During the struggle between the King and the Chamber of Deputies, the tricolour party, reduced to nine deputies, had had no direct influence. The plots for overthrowing the monarchy (Didier at Grenoble, the patriots at Paris) were nothing but isolated attempts, ignored or disowned by the party.

Government of the Constitutional Party (1816-20).—The new Chamber, meeting in November, 1816, was made up almost entirely of Constitutional Royalists, supporters of the ministry; the two extremes, the Liberals and the Ultras, were reduced to two small groups. The policy of the King and his ministers was to maintain their power by reassuring those members of the middle class who were interested in supporting the Charter, especially the purchasers of confiscated estates, whom the "*Chambre Introuvable*" had made uneasy. Louis XVIII. said in his opening speech to the Parliament: "May hatred cease, may the children of the same country be as brothers." In 1818 he said: "The system which I have adopted reposes on the principle that one cannot be King over two peoples; all the efforts of my government are to make of these two peoples, who unfortunately dwell side by side, a united nation."

A regular political life now began. The fundamental question of supremacy of King or Deputies was dropped; the Chamber left the King free to choose his ministers and to direct politics generally, occupying itself with questions of finance. Under the Empire the budget had hardly been anything but a sham; often exceeded by the ministers and made fictitious by carrying over from one year to another. In 1817 the minister of war had exceeded the 36,000,000 granted; verification was put off indefinitely, there being no fixed term for the liquidation of each budget, and this permitted the carrying forward of unspent funds to the account of another year. Instead of a single budget there were several special ones; the cost of collection was deducted from the budget of receipts, which complicated the work of auditing. The Chamber passed financial laws which determined in France the rules for the formation and verification of the budget. The law of 1818 obliged each minister to present each year the account for the work of the past year, comparing the expenditures ordered by him with the appropriations made by the Chamber; the minister of finance must add to this a general summing up of the departmental budgets, the account of the gross receipts, the account of

the public debt, and the Treasury report. The House is thus kept informed of the sums received, spent, and left on hand. The special budgets were gradually suppressed (from 1817 to 1829). The system was completed by the suppression of the transfer of items from one year to another (1822).

The Chamber of Deputies also legislated on two political questions as to which only general principles were set forth in the Charter, the electoral system and the control of the press. They adopted (1817) the partial renewal of the House, one-fifth each year, and election by a single college meeting at the chief town of the department; each elector must be 30 years old and pay 300 francs direct tax, each candidate 40 years old and pay 1000 francs in taxes; this was the system demanded by the industrial upper-middle class, the mainstay of the Liberal party. The law on the press, long expected, was passed (1819) under the influence of a group of admirers of the English Tories, the doctrinaires (Guizot, Broglie, Royer-Collard). This was an imitation of the English system; no more censorship, jury trial for press cases, newspapers subjected to stamp and deposit of security.* They had wanted free political papers, guaranteed by the jury against the abuse of the government power, but only the journals of the middle class; in demanding an enormous deposit for the establishment of a paper (200,000 francs), in imposing on each copy a stamp tax, they made the press a luxury beyond the reach of the greater part of the nation.

This was a period of reorganization. French territory was evacuated by the armies of the Allies. The debt was consolidated and the budget balanced. The provost courts were suppressed. The standing army was organized with the system of drafting by lot, with the right of getting a substitute and 7 years service (this system lasted until 1871). The University retained the monopoly of higher and secondary education. A Catholic party, improperly nick-named the Congregation,† had formed to strengthen the power of the clergy; they demanded the abolition of Napoleon's Concordat. The Pope and Louis XVIII. agreed to conclude a new Concordat; the Houses, however, refused.

* The deposit of money as security for good behaviour was never required in England.—TR.

† The *Congrégation* was a private society founded at Paris in 1816. The members combined to carry on charitable work; they had the same ideal as the Catholic party, but it is by no means certain that they were the leaders of it.

All this time the Liberals were gaining strength; each year they gained seats; they had 25 deputies in 1817, 45 in 1818, 90 in 1819. The foreign powers were alarmed and urged Louis XVIII. to take measures against these enemies of his house; Louis accepted the resignation of Richelieu, who favoured this policy (December, 1818) and kept the ministers who favoured a non-partisan policy (Decazes ministry). Then the constitutional majority which had supported the Richelieu ministry divided into two parts. The Left Centre continued to support the ministry, the Right Centre reproached the ministry with doing nothing against the revolution and proposed to modify the electoral law so as to prevent the election of Liberals; finally it joined the Ultras against the ministry. Decazes at first resisted; he had 73 peers created in order to keep the majority in the Chamber of Peers, and carried liberal press law. But he had against him the Count of Artois, the court, the Catholic party, and could maintain himself only by the personal support of the King. He decided to satisfy the Right by proposing a new electoral law. But, already weakened by the election of the old Conventionist, Abbé Grégoire, in 1819, he could not resist the anger of the Royalists, who were excited by the assassination of the Duke de Berry (1820). The murderer had acted on his own impulse, but the Liberals were held responsible. Louis XVIII. resigned himself to desert Decazes and took a ministry from the Right (Richelieu), which began the struggle against the Liberals.

Government of the Right (1820-27).—For seven years the Right had the majority in the Chamber and kept the ministry by maintaining harmony with the King, first Louis XVIII., now old and weak, and after 1824, Charles X., the former leader of the Ultras, personally favourable to the politics of the Right. The president of the ministry was first the Duke of Richelieu, but the real leader of the majority and of the government was Villèle, one of the Ultra orators in the "*Chambre Introuvable*."

The Right, on assuming control, at once cancelled the political work of the preceding years, the electoral and press laws. An ordinance in 1820 re-established provisionally the full censorship. The government's permission was once more necessary for starting a paper, permission of the censors for publishing each issue, and any paper might be suspended for six months by mere executive order. The electoral law of 1820 enlarged the Chamber and restored the electoral colleges. The number of members was increased to 430, elected for five years, and renewed in full at

each election, but by two different systems: first, all the qualified voters meeting in colleges, by arrondissements, as in 1815, elected 258 members (since 1816 the total membership). Then the electors whose tax reached the amount necessary for being elected as members (1000 francs) met in colleges by departments, to elect 172 additional members. These latter, therefore, had a *double vote*.

The new elections under this system (November, 1820) resulted in an enormous majority for the Right, which decisively assured the power to the Ultras. The posthumous birth of an heir to the Duke de Berry (the Count of Chambord) completed the consolidation of the party by assuring the succession of the older branch of the Bourbons.

The tricolour party, reduced to a powerless minority in the House, gave up working by legal methods and once more began to incite revolution. This was the period of military revolutions in Spain and Italy. The French *Charbonnerie*, modelled on the Italian Carbonari, was a secret society divided into sections of twenty members called, as in Italy, *ventes*, and directed by a central committee, the High Twenty. The object announced in the founding of this society was to give the French the free exercise of their right to choose their government, "seeing that the Bourbons were restored by foreign power." They talked of overthrowing the Bourbons, but they could not agree on the system to succeed them, for the revolutionists were a coalition of Republicans and Imperialists. They counted on accomplishing their object by an insurrection (the *Charbonniers* were under pledge to have arms always ready), and particularly, as in Spain and Italy, by raising a revolt in the army. They also hoped for aid from the revolutionists of other countries, with whom they kept in touch through the Cosmopolitan Alliance. It seems that the Liberal leaders of the Chamber, Lafayette and Manuel, had knowledge of these revolutionists, if they did not encourage them. The Free Masons reorganized themselves about the same time to oppose the clergy, but it has never been proved that they worked in concert with the secret political societies.

Many attempts were made at insurrection: at Belfort, at Colmar, at Toulon, at Saumur (1822); none of them succeeded; everywhere the conspirators were executed, "the four sergeants of Rochelle," affiliated with the *Charbonniers*, were put to death. There were also demonstrations by the students with cries of "Long live the Charter!" This was the motto chosen by the

Liberals, in order not to frighten the middle class. The demonstration by the students about Paris led to a scrimmage in which several persons were wounded.

The Right continued to control the House. They passed a press law in 1822 which maintained the principle of previous authorization for newspapers, and the government right to suspend the publication, and gave the judgment of press cases to the common courts composed of magistrates dependent on the government. Censorship was abolished, but the ministry could re-establish it by an ordinance. (There was even talk of forbidding the foundation of any new papers and buying up the old ones one by one.) In fact, the press was subject to a system of prosecutions and condemnations which made opposition almost impossible. Even when the government found no cause for prosecution, they could bring a "charge of tendency"—*procès de tendance*—and have the paper condemned for a series of articles, no one of which was punishable, but which taken together indicated a subversive tendency.

The Right was sufficiently strong to oblige the King to make war on Spain in order to re-establish absolutism. Manuel, for having recalled the execution of Louis XVI., was expelled from the Chamber; the Liberal deputies then withdrew (March, 1823). The ministry, taking advantage of the Royalist sentiment among the electors, carried the law fixing the duration of the House at seven years. They then dissolved the Chamber and openly ordered all officials to support government candidates. The keeper of the seals set forth in a circular this principle: "Whoever accepts a post in the public service at the same time pledges himself to consecrate to the government's service his efforts, his talent, his influence."

The Chamber elected under these conditions (February, 1824) was composed so largely of Ultras that it was called the *Chambre Retrouvée* (found again); there were only 19 Liberals. The ideal held by the majority was expressed during the election period. The program of the Liberal papers (*Constitutionnel* and *Courrier*) said: "Electors! will you prevent the schemes which propose: 1st, to give the clergy control of marriage, to assure them an independent income, and to give them control of the instruction of our youth; 2d, to re-establish the trade guilds and monopolies; 3d, to deprive the holders of industrial licenses of their political influence; 4th, to introduce into legislation some means of founding a landed aristocracy; 5th, to grant compensation to the

émigrés (for the loss of their estates); 6th, to interpose legal obstacles to the subdivision of property?" The Royalist *Quotidienne* replied: "If the Liberals go to the polls to prevent these things, we counsel the Royalists to go in order to have these things done."

The majority accepted the constitutional system that had placed it in power; but its own wish was to re-establish a landed aristocracy and the authority of the clergy. Louis XVIII. died in 1824 and his successor was the old leader of the Ultras, Charles X. The Chamber, the Ministry, and the King were in harmony as to undertaking a work of restoration. Being unable to restore the confiscated estates, which had been guaranteed to the purchasers by the Charter, they granted the dispossessed *émigrés* a thousand millions of francs as compensation. The sum was raised by an issue of bonds; and the occasion was used to convert the outstanding five per cents into three per cents (1825). In 1826 a law was passed against sacrilege, punishing with death the theft of articles from the churches and the profanation of sacred vessels and the host. The Chamber had even adopted the punishment of parricide for these offences, but the Peers rejected it. The act was a symbolic one, intended to show that the law took note of crimes against religion. The number of dioceses was increased. A bishop was appointed Grand Master of the University. In 1824 teachers were subjected to the supervision of the bishops. Newspapers were prosecuted and officials dismissed.

But this policy aroused against the party in power an opposition of three classes: the Liberals, who were directly attacked; the manufacturers, threatened by the landed aristocracy; the Gallicans, disturbed by seeing the Ultramontanes strengthened (this was the party favouring the power of the Pope). An old Gallican Royalist, Montlosier, in a book that was widely read, denounced the Congregation and demanded the expulsion of the Jesuits. This order had re-established itself in France contrary to law, not having received the sanction of the French government. Montlosier demanded in 1826 that the Articles of the Gallican Church of 1682 be taught in the schools. The Catholic party divided. Some of the bishops signed a declaration against the Jesuits; the Paris Court of Appeal declared the principles of the Jesuits to be incompatible with the Charter. In the Chamber the Gallicans left the Catholics and joined the Voltaireans against the Ultramontanes. The Royalist party also broke up.

The Left Centre, dissatisfied with the policy of the Right, turned against the ministry and joined the Liberals. A group of the extreme Right went into opposition for personal reasons (it was called the *Defection*). The Chamber of Peers, independent of the ministers, assumed the position of defending Liberal institutions against the Chamber of Deputies. It rejected the bill giving a double share of the inheritance to the eldest son in case of families whose direct tax was 3000 francs or upward. It stopped the famous bill relating to the press (nicknamed the "Vandal Bill") which would have compelled every newspaper to deposit with the government the manuscript copy of every issue five days before publication. It voted a bill on juries which admitted as jurors, in addition to property owners, the members of the learned professions.

The ministry tried to crush opposition. It dismissed office-holders who opposed the new press law. It closed the Normal School. It proposed to abolish jury trial. The National Guard of Paris, composed of picked men of the middle class, cried at a review by the King: "Long live the Charter! Down with the ministers!" It was broken up. Finally the ministry re-established the censorship by ordinance in 1827. The opposition replied by founding the Association for defending the Liberty of the Press. In order to get a majority in the Chamber of Peers, Villèle created 76 new peers, most of them taken from among the deputies. But instead of retaining the Chamber of Deputies, which might lawfully have run to 1831, he had it dissolved, counting on managing the elections as in 1824. In order to give the opposition no time for organizing, he had the elections appointed for a day only two weeks ahead.

Conflict between the King and the Chamber (1827-30).—At the elections of November, 1827, all the opponents of the ministry united against it: Liberals, Left Centre, and Defection. The voters were irritated by the aristocratic leanings of the Right. The bondholders disliked it for the conversion of the 5 per cents into 3 per cents carried out in 1825. The new Chamber had a strong opposition majority, 190 of them belonging to the Left. The Villèle ministry resigned. Charles X. was prevailed on to take a ministry, not from the majority, but at least from the Liberal Right Centre, the Martignac ministry of January, 1828. This was a return to Decazes' policy of conciliation.

The Martignac ministry drew up a conciliatory speech from the throne, reopened the courses of Cousin and Guizot, and made

some changes of prefects. It carried, in 1828, a bill against election frauds, requiring that the list of voters be posted in every commune early enough to give time for corrections and additions; also a press act which abolished the censorship, the requirement of previous license, and the offence of *tendance*.

To satisfy the Gallicans the government by ordinance forbade unauthorized religious orders to have the management of educational institutions. In order to maintain the monopoly of the University, it forbade the small seminaries to receive day pupils, and limited to 20,000 the whole number of their pupils; they were to receive only candidates for the priesthood. The bishops rejected these measures at first, but the government got from the Pope a censure of their conduct. To satisfy the Liberals the ministry had the King say in the speech from the throne in 1829: "France knows as you do on what bases her welfare rests, and those who seek it elsewhere than in a sincere union of royal authority and the liberties that the Charter has consecrated, will be promptly disavowed by her." It was the Left that, for the first time, was charged with drawing up the address in reply.

But Charles X. had endured this ministry with grudging; he thought himself entitled to choose his ministers without needing the approval of the Chamber. "I should prefer to saw wood," said he, "than to be a King in the position of the English King." The members of the Left itself gave the Martignac ministry but feeble support, alleging that they had no representative in it. They voted with the extreme Right against the bill relating to the councils of the departments and municipalities. Charles X. considered the attempt at conciliation as a failure. He said to Martignac in April, 1829: "I told you so; nothing could satisfy those people." He waited till the budget was voted and the session closed; then he dismissed the Martignac ministry and formed a ministry of Ultras, presided over by one of his personal friends, an emigrant, Count Polignac.

Charles X. exercised the royal prerogatives, as Louis XVIII. had done in 1816, by governing with a ministry frankly opposed to the Chamber. But Louis XVIII. had had the middle class and the cities on his side against the Unfindable Chamber; Charles X. had them against him. People began to speak of legal resistance. The Chamber had one indirect means of forcing the ministry to retire, namely the refusal of supplies. If the ministry should attempt to levy taxes without legal authority, the taxpayers would refuse to pay them. The *Journal des Débats*, an organ of the

Left Centre, said, on the 10th of August, 1829: "The Charter has now an authority against which all the efforts of despotism will fail. The people will pay a thousand millions to the law; they will not pay one to the ordinances of a minister. If illegal taxes were demanded, a Hampden would arise to crush them. . . The article concluded with the words "Unhappy France! Unhappy King!" The writer was prosecuted and condemned, but was acquitted on appeal. The opposition organized associations to resist the collection of taxes, in case the ministers violated the Charter. The first was the League of Breton Resistance; another was the "Help Thyself and Heaven Will Help Thee," in which Constitutional Royalists, such as Guizot and Broglie, united with young Republicans. Lafayette, regarded as the representative of the Revolution, made a political tour in the South. He was triumphantly received by the Liberals and Free Masons.

The adversaries of the Bourbons tried to take advantage of the general irritation to convert the resistance to the ministers into a revolution against the royal family.

There was already in Paris a small Republican party composed chiefly of students and labouring men. It was little known, for it had neither deputy nor journal; but it was in communication with Lafayette and ready to fight. It had erected barricades in 1827, at the time of the elections—the first seen in Paris since the Fronde (on the great days of the Revolution the crowds went forward to attack, and did not need to raise barricades for defence).

Another small but very active party was formed to replace the older line of the Bourbons with the younger Orleanist branch, descended from Philippe, brother of Louis XIV. Louis Philippe, Duke of Orleans, son of Philippe Egalité, had fought in the Republican army in 1792.* Returning in 1814, he had been coldly treated at court, but had made himself popular with the middle class by sending his sons to the ordinary colleges and by avowing Liberal and Voltairean opinions. The Orleanist party was started secretly at a meeting held, in 1829, at the house of Talleyrand's niece, between two former Imperial ministers, Talleyrand and Baron Louis, and two young writers from the south, Thiers and Mignet, both of them champions of the Revolution. It was decided to publish a journal, which appeared as the *National*,

* The public was not aware, at that time, that, under the empire, he had tried to take service in the foreign armies: the fact was not divulged until after 1840.

edited by Armand Carrel. As was the fashion with the Constitutionalists, Carrel took his illustrations from English history. He wrote an article praising the revolution of 1688: the English nation had delivered itself from an oppressive king by avoiding the republic and simply substituting one branch of the royal family for another. The allusion was clear.

The conflict between the Chamber and the ministry became open at the beginning of the session of 1830. The speech from the throne said: "If culpable manœuvres should raise against my government obstacles which I do not and must not anticipate, my resolution to maintain the public peace would give me the strength to surmount them." The Chamber replied in an address voted by 221 deputies: "The Charter consecrates as a right the intervention of the nation in the deliberations regarding its interests. It has made the continuous agreement of the wishes of your government with the wishes of your people the indispensable condition of orderly progress in public affairs. This agreement does not now exist" (March, 1830). Charles X. at once prorogued the Chamber and then dissolved it. "This is not a question of the ministry," said he, "but a question of the monarchy." The King, in virtue of his royal power, believed he had the right, in case of disagreement with the Chamber, to enforce his own will. The Chamber, as representing the people (it was not yet reproached with only representing the rich), wished to compel him to yield before the will of the nation. It had never, since 1814, been necessary to decide the question—the majority of the Chamber never having resisted the King, except in the case of the Unfindable Chamber, which was not supported by the nation. In 1830 the two irreconcilable theories, sovereignty of the King and sovereignty of the people, were brought squarely into conflict. According to the maxim borrowed from England, the King could not be responsible: the ministers alone could be. But by upholding his ministers, Charles X. had made the fiction of irresponsibility impossible. The conflict was henceforth between the King and the Chamber.

Revolution of 1830.—Charles X. made some changes in his ministry and ordered a new general election. In the new Chamber, instead of 221 opposition members, there were 270. The King, in spite of the warnings of the Tsar and Metternich, decided to crush the opposition by a *coup d'état*. The French army had just taken Algiers, and the government was making an alliance with the Tsar for the purpose of reconquering the Rhine

boundary. The King therefore supposed he could count with certainty on the army. Polignac had had a vision of the Virgin, who admonished him to deliver his country from the domestic enemy. The Archbishop of Paris, in conducting a service of thanksgiving for the victory of Algiers, gave the same counsel.

The ministry, relying on Article 14 of the *Charte*, "The King makes such regulations and ordinances as are necessary for the execution of the laws and the safety of the state," published the four ordinances of July 26. These dissolved the new Chamber before it had been called together, and purported to change the laws regarding elections and the press. They restored the censorship and reduced the Chamber to 258 members, one-fifth to be elected annually. The elections were to be by departments, and none but land taxes were to qualify for voting—a provision which would exclude the manufacturers, nearly all of whom belonged to the opposition. The King and his ministers held that their action was in accordance with the constitution. Polignac wrote in a secret memoir: "The ministers are willing at need to suspend it in order to strengthen it." They had so little thought of resistance that they had only 14,000 soldiers in Paris and the King went on with his shooting at Rambouillet.

In truth the Constitutional party, in spite of its majority in the Chamber, was not organized for a conflict. The ordinances attacked both the Chamber and the newspapers. But the Chamber had not yet met. The Constitutionalist deputies who were about Paris held a meeting on hearing of the ordinances, and resolved on *legal* resistance, but were unable to agree on practical measures. The Liberal editors issued a protest: "The government has violated the law; we are under no obligation to obey it, we shall endeavour to publish our papers without asking the permission of the censors. The government has this day lost the character of legality which gives the right to demand obedience. For our part, we shall resist it; it is for France to judge how far her resistance shall extend." This was an indirect summons to revolt; but the press had no means of action. The revolution of 1830 was the work neither of the deputies nor of the editors.

An armed force was needed to oppose the troops in Paris; it was the party of the tricolour which furnished this. There had been for some years in Paris a revolutionary party made up of young men, students, and labourers. Their leader, Godefroy Cavaignac, son of a member of the Convention of 1792, wished to re-establish the republic of 1793. His associates were lack-

ing in precise ideas, but hatred of the Bourbons and love of the tricolour flag kept them together. They were not very numerous, having from eight to ten thousand combatants at most. The government had considered them unworthy of notice. This weak and obscure organization it was that made the revolution of 1830. They were favoured by a combination of exceptional conditions. 1st, The government was almost as badly armed as the insurgents, having only 14,000 soldiers in Paris (there was no Parisian police force at that date), and with the flintlocks still in use, the soldiers had no advantage in arms over civilians. 2d, The Paris of that time, especially in the eastern portions, was a labyrinth of narrow and crooked lanes. It was possible, using the large and heavy paving stones of the time, to construct in a few minutes a barricade sufficient to stop the march of troops. Further, the officers had had no experience of street fighting. 3d, The soldiers were reluctant to make war on the populace. 4th, The insurgents hoisted the tricolour flag—which the labourers and even the soldiers still regarded as the national colours.

The struggle lasted three days. On July 27 the Republicans fired some shots and began to build barricades. On the 28th the eastern section was honeycombed with barricades; the insurgents took possession of the City Hall and Notre Dame Cathedral, and hoisted over them the *tricolore*. There were no more cries of *Vive la Charte!* The cry now was "Down with the Bourbons!" Marmont, commanding the troops, sent his men forward in two columns, one through the boulevards toward the Bastille, the other along the Seine toward the City Hall. Behind them, after they had passed, the barricades were rebuilt; the soldiers, worn out with their exertions and the heat, fired upon from windows, and pelted with stones, tiles, and pieces of furniture, were unable to pass the barricades of the Rue Saint-Antoine and, abandoning the east of Paris, retreated to the Louvre. On the 29th the insurgents took the offensive in the western section, attacked the troops in their barracks, and the Swiss at the Tuileries. A number of soldiers of the line joined the insurgents. The rest of the army evacuated Paris. After the fight, some of the deputies, meeting with Laffitte, organized an executive committee to "guard the safety of person and property." This committee established itself at the Hôtel de Ville, restored the national guard, and placed military control in the hands of Lafayette. Charles X. had decided, after the third day, to withdraw his ordinances and to make terms with the insurgents. The committee, how-

ever, refused to receive his envoys; France was tired of the Bourbons.

Paris was in the hands of two parties who had united against Charles X., the Republicans and the Liberal-Royalists. The former controlled the east of Paris and the Hôtel de Ville; the latter controlled the west of Paris and the Chamber of Deputies. They adopted the tricolour flag, but did not want a republic. The partisans of the Duke of Orléans took advantage of this state of affairs to establish a combination of royalty as represented by the younger branch, with the tricolour flag and the Charter. They divulged their plan gradually. First they posted a proclamation drawn up by Thiers: "Charles X. cannot return to Paris, he has shed the nation's blood. A republic would expose us to horrible dissensions, it would embroil us with all Europe. The Duke of Orléans is a prince devoted to the cause of the Revolution. . . He was at Jemmapes. . . He is a citizen-King. He has borne the tricolour standard in the midst of battle, he alone can bear it again. He awaits our call. Let us issue this call, and he will accept the Charter, as we have always wished it to be. It is at the hands of the French nation that he will receive his crown." Then Laffitte and Thiers went to where the Duke was waiting outside the city, and brought him to Paris. The Duke took possession of the Royal Palace, and declared himself only Lieutenant General of the Kingdom until the opening of the legislative houses. He added: "A Charter shall be henceforth a reality." A proclamation drawn up by Guizot and signed by 91 deputies announced his resolution: "The Duke of Orléans is devoted to the cause of the nation and the constitution. . . He will respect our rights, for he will receive his own from us" (July 30). The Chamber of Deputies met again and named Louis Philippe Lieutenant General of the Kingdom.

But at the Hôtel de Ville there remained a semi-Republican government. Louis Philippe made his famous ride across the still armed city and presented himself before the Committee; there he had the Chamber's declaration read, kissed Lafayette, and was cheered by the people (July 31). The Republicans made no opposition, knowing that there was no wish for a republic in France. Cavaignac replied to Duvergier's thanks: "You are wrong in thanking us, we have yielded because we are not ready for resistance."

The revolution did not spread beyond Paris and Louis Philippe remained only Lieutenant General. Charles X. tried to preserve

the crown for his family by accepting the revolution; he appointed the Duke of Orléans Lieutenant General, then he and his son abdicated in favour of the rightful heir, his grandson, Henry V., and intrusted the regency to Louis Philippe. But the Chamber, by a vote of 219 to 33 (there being but 252 of the 430 deputies present), declared the throne vacant, and proclaimed Louis Philippe I. King of the French (August 7).

Charles X., with his court and his guard, had retired to Rambouillet, where he could continue the war. The national guards of Paris marched on Rambouillet in disorder; but Charles made no attempt to resist them. He fled to England. In France the news of the revolution had been carried everywhere, together with the tricolour flag; the people received it with joy, happy in the restoration of the national colours. Not a man made any resistance.

The Political System of Louis Philippe.—The revolution had been brought on by a conflict between the King and the people. Its result was to proclaim publicly the sovereignty of the people. Thiers' declaration said: "It is from the French people that he [Louis Philippe] will hold his crown." Guizot said: "He will respect our rights, for it is from us that he will hold his." Louis Philippe accepted this doctrine. He called himself "King of the French by the grace of God and the good will of the nation." Before he took possession of the throne, the Charter was read to him; he signed it and swore to uphold it. It was understood that this was no longer a Charter *granted* by the King as in 1814, but a Charter imposed by the nation and *agreed to* by the King. The Chambers limited themselves to *revising* the Charter, but the report called the revised Charter a "new establishment," and defined its position thus: "It is the case of a nation, in full possession of its rights, saying to the prince on whom it intends to confer the crown: 'Under the conditions written in the law, will you reign over us?'" In this way the question of the royal power was settled by the judgment of the people, that is to say, of the Chamber. Article 14, which had served as the basis of Charles X.'s *coup d'état*, was modified to read: "The King issues the ordinances necessary for the execution of the laws, but never has power to suspend the laws or prevent their execution."

Guizot's declaration had announced "guarantees for establishing firm and lasting liberty": the re-establishment of the national guard, jury trial for press cases, "legally determined responsi-

bility of ministers, the position of soldiers to be regulated by law, the citizens to share in the formation of municipal and departmental administrations." The revised Charter contained the promise of laws relating to juries, the national guard, and municipal and departmental organization; it also forbade the censorship of the press and guaranteed freedom of education. Finally, in order to indicate the equality of religions the formula "the Catholic religion is the religion of France" was changed to "the Catholic religion is the religion professed by the majority of the French."

The revision slightly changed the mechanism of the Chambers and of the elections. The Deputies had the right to elect their president and to take the initiative in law-making (not yet individually for each member, but collectively); the age for eligibility was lowered from 40 to 30 years.

Two laws completed the revision: one lowered the voting qualification from 300 to 200 francs in taxes; the other made the peerage no longer hereditary, but for life only (1831).

This new *régime*, called the "July Monarchy" because it was the result of the July revolution, was very little different from that of the Restoration. The real change consisted in giving the power to a new set of men. The royal family of the Bourbons, bound by tradition to the old *régime*, favouring the maintenance of the aristocracy and the power of the clergy, gave place to the family of Orleans, half *bourgeois* and Voltairean, and obliged to lean upon the Liberal middle class. The Chamber of Peers had been deprived of half of its former members (175 of the 539 peers refused to take the oath of allegiance to Louis Philippe), robbed of its hereditary privileges, and had lost its influence in the government. Political power was concentrated in the Chamber of Deputies; the majority belonged henceforth to the Liberal middle class, the enemy of the nobility and clergy, who gave political life a tendency directly opposed to that of the Restoration.

A new political force was created by the Revolution and recognised by the Charter. "The Charter, and all the rights which it consecrates, remain intrusted to the patriotism and courage of the national guards." The national guard, reorganized in 1831, was composed of all taxpayers who could afford to purchase a uniform; they elected their own officers up to the rank of captain. The national guard of Paris took the place of the royal guard, which had been suppressed; it was the armed force charged with defending the government. It was, however, a

political organ as well. Louis Philippe personally reviewed the national guards amid cheers, which were the principal manifestation of public opinion. This political character of the national guard was the most original feature of the July régime.

Party Struggle in the Government (1830-31).—Louis Philippe, enthroned by a Paris insurrection, dubbed "King of the barricades" by the legitimists, had promptly to show gratitude to the insurgents. A national recompense was voted for the victims of the July Revolution, a monument was erected on the site of the Bastille "in memory of the citizens who died in fighting for the defence of public liberties." The King gave an audience to "those condemned for political offences." The King came out on foot with an umbrella, shook hands with the members of the national guards, and allowed workingmen to offer him glasses of wine. These democratic manifestations supplied material for joking in the salons and the legitimist newspapers; which also ridiculed the "insurrection of beggars," who had come to demand government situations, and said that Lafayette had endorsed 70,000 requests for office.

The government remained divided into the two parties which had conducted the Revolution: the old revolutionary party of the tricolour flag, which had prepared the uprising against the Bourbons and formed the executive committee of the Hôtel de Ville (Lafayette, Laffitte, Dupont); the constitutional party (Guizot, Broglie, Dupin), which had taken charge of the Chamber and induced it to accept the Duke of Orléans.

Louis Philippe, in shaking off the young Republicans, had not dared to break with the leaders of the tricolour party, who alone were making the new order of things popular in Paris. He therefore called to the government men of both sections of his supporters; he gave seven portfolios to the Constitutionalists, to the Liberals four portfolios and in addition the command of the national guards (Lafayette) and the prefecture of the Seine (Odilon Barrot).

There was therefore in the ministry a continual struggle over the general policy to be pursued. The *party of action* (Lafayette, Laffitte) wished to let the so-called "consequences of July" work themselves out. They would sustain the democratic party, and resist the clergy, at home; and would aid abroad the peoples who rebelled against monarchical governments. The *party of resistance* (Guizot, Broglie, Casimir-Perier) declared the revolution at an end; they wished to combat the Republicans at home, giving

the power to the middle class; also to maintain peace abroad and reconcile France with the monarchies.

The party of action had most influence at first; they had the advantage of having the support of the national guard and the Parisian insurgents. Their policy was to let the people of Paris show what they wanted. The people wished first of all the death of the four ministers of Charles X. who had signed the ordinances. In order to save them, the "party of resistance" carried in the Chamber an address favouring the abolition of the death penalty for political offences. The people rebelled and attacked the Royal Palace and the fortress of Vincennes, where the ministers of Charles X. were imprisoned. The Resistance section of the ministry resigned, and Louis Philippe, while himself favouring the Resistance, gave the government to the leaders of the progressive party. He hoped thereby to get done with them more quickly. This Laffitte ministry (November 2, 1830-March 13, 1831) protected Charles' ministers and the Court of Peers which tried them, by lining the streets with soldiers. The clergy having sustained Charles' government, the Revolution of 1830 had been a victory for the Liberal Voltaireans over the legitimist clergy. In the country the mission crosses had been thrown down, priests and monks insulted. In Paris the mobs sacked the Church of Saint-Germain-l'Auxerrois, where the legitimists had organized a service in memory of the Duke de Berry; they demolished the Archbishop's palace for hate of the Archbishop, who, in 1830, had advised Charles X. to make a military *coup d'état*. The government made no earnest effort to prevent these outbreaks. Louis Philippe did not dare to join publicly in the celebration of the mass, and therefore had a private service in a private chapel. His coronation was conducted without any religious forms.

The party of action had for opponents the middle class, who were frightened at the prospect of war and distressed by the commercial crisis. Business was at a standstill. One hundred and fifty thousand persons, it was said, had left Paris. The unemployed made public demonstrations. The three per cent. bonds had fallen to 52 francs, the five per cents to 82 francs. Laffitte himself had to go into liquidation with his banking house. Louis Philippe did not want an aggressive foreign policy; he forbade his ministers to interfere in Italy or in Poland. Then the party of action retired from office; the party of resistance took the power under Casimir-Perier (March 13, 1831).

The new policy was to consolidate the royal power, to secure the government to the middle class by crushing the democratic party, and to maintain peace with outside powers by abstaining from interference with them. The Chamber of 1830 was dissolved, and deputies were chosen under the new electoral system by the 200-franc voters. The ministry gained a distinct majority. Casimir-Perier indicated his policy in the speech from the throne: "France has wished royalty to be national; she has not wished it to be impotent." He persuaded the King to leave the Palais Royal, his ducal residence, and take possession of the Tuileries, the King's palace. He passed a law forbidding armed assemblages. He forbade all government officials to join the *National Association*, which had been founded to oppose the Bourbon and foreign influence. "France is to be governed," said the *Journal des Débats*.

Struggle against Insurrections (1831-34).—The monarchy of Louis Philippe which had become the government of the middle class, was now attacked from two opposite sides at once. Two parties organized insurrections for the purpose of overturning the government.

The supporters of the elder branch, known to their adversaries as the *Carlists*, but calling themselves the *Legitimists*, made at Paris an attempt to carry off the royal family (the Prouvaires Street Plot, February, 1832). Their great power was, however, in the west, in the old province of Vendée. It was there that the Duchess of Berry, mother of Henry V., after an unsuccessful attack on Marseilles, incited the romantic insurrection which ended in her capture (June-November, 1832). The Legitimists renounced war and fell back on the press as a weapon.

The Republicans who reproached the Orleanists with having "juggled" the revolution of 1830, tried to bring on another Republican revolution by the same process that had been used with such success against Charles X., riot and barricades in Paris. They were as in 1830 a crowd of students and workingmen, organized as armed secret societies. The object was to re-establish the republic of 1793; their ideal was the Convention. Their scheme was to meet in arms, to barricade the tortuous lanes of the Saint-Martin and Saint-Denis quarters, and to watch for a favourable chance to march upon the Hôtel de Ville and the Tuileries and proclaim the republic. We must remember that this plan, which seems to us inconceivable, was proposed under conditions which have since disappeared. There was no political life

outside of Paris, and it was only necessary to gain control of Paris in order to impose a government on France. Paris was at this period confined to the limits of the twelve old arrondissements. The bourgeois population of the western quarters was small and passive; the eastern quarters, where the working classes were massed, especially on the right bank, formed a strong place, easy to defend with barricades and near the centre of political life, the Hôtel de Ville and the Tuileries. The government had really no other defence but the national guard, of which a part could probably be led to desert.

The Republican party was directed by secret societies formed of the most determined members of the party. These men began the insurrection, followed by the malcontents, especially workingmen and small boys who came to help them build barricades and fight. Those who were unarmed went into the house of a bourgeois of the national guard and took his gun. When the government dissolved a secret society, the Republicans formed a new one under another name. There were successively: the society of the "People's Friends," dissolved in 1831, which led the riots against the ministers of Charles X. and Saint-Germain-l'Auxerrois; the society for the "Rights of Man," the most powerful of all, which directed the two great insurrections of 1832 and 1834; the society of the "Families" (1837), and the society of the "Seasons" which led the insurrection of 1839.

The Rights of Man Society was organized like an army, divided into sections of 20 members (to evade the law which forbade the association of more than 20 persons), each section having a president and vice president; these sections were grouped in series, each having its president. In Paris all the later societies followed this system. In Lyons emissaries of the Rights of Man Society created a similar organization. They found the workmen of Lyons excited by the insurrection of November, 1831, which had been merely an industrial outbreak without any political object. During the commercial crisis produced by the revolution of 1830 the silk manufacturers had made a reduction in wages; the silk weavers of Lyons, carrying on the industry in their own houses, procured from the municipality and from the prefect permission to hold a meeting of delegates representing both the manufacturers and the workingmen, to fix a minimum wage. The prefect accepted the decision, but the manufacturers refused it and stopped all work. The weavers came down from the Croix Rousse with a black flag bearing the famous inscrip-

tion: *Vivre en travaillant ou mourir en combattant* (Live by labour or die fighting). After the combat the weavers remained masters of the city for ten days. This uprising gave the workmen of Lyons a realization of their own unity and power. The Republicans organized them in the form of a mutual aid society, the *Mutualists*, divided into 122 lodges of 20 members each, with a treasury and a newspaper.

The Republican party, without counting the little outbreaks in Paris in 1830 and 1831* and the Grenoble riot (March, 1832), made two great insurrections.

First. In 1832, during the Legitimist uprising in la Vendée, on the occasion of the funeral of General Lamarque, the Republicans, re-enforced by Polish, Italian, and German refugees, gathered around the platform on which the body rested and proposed to proclaim a republic. An insurrection began which for one night made them masters of the east of Paris. Then they were gradually driven back by the national guard and 25,000 soldiers and surrounded in the Saint-Martin quarter, where the movement was crushed by the battle of Saint-Merry Cloister (June 5-6).

Second. In 1834, rebellion broke out at Lyons when the government, after a strike by the silk-weavers, proscribed the Mutualist Society and arrested its leaders. The fight lasted four days. The movement which the Paris Republicans were preparing was broken up by the arrest of their leaders, 150 members of the Rights of Man Society. It amounted to nothing more than a fight in the Marais, rendered famous by the "massacre of the Rue Transnonain" (April 13-14).

In the same period the Republican party had a political paper, the *Tribune*, which attacked the King and the government of the *bourgeoisie*, and some illustrated papers (the *Charivari* and the *Caricature*) which used the King as their butt. They represented him as juggling with Revolution and Liberty as his balls, or fleeing after having cut the throat of Liberty (this was a parody of Prudhon's picture), or pictured him with a figure shaped like a pear. In this state of society, so unaccustomed to the liberty of the press, these attacks and caricatures seemed an intolerable insult to authority; the pear caricatures were prosecuted as an outrage against the king. The *Tribune* in four years was prosecuted 111 times; 20 times the editors were condemned, involv-

* That of the Place Vendôme was dispersed by turning fire engines on the rioters.

ing 49 years' imprisonment and 157,000 francs in fines. The editor-in-chief was even arraigned before the Chamber of Deputies.

Suppression of the Republican Party (1834-35).—In order to struggle against the Republicans, the Chambers adopted a system of coercive laws, designed to restrain political liberty by hindering the propagation and manifestation of Republican sentiments. They had begun with offences against the King and the Chambers, against seditious placards (1830) and mobs (1831). The Deputies passed a law against seditious cries (February, 1834), a law forbidding firearms being kept in houses, a law against associations. After the troubles in April it was necessary to pass judgment upon the Republicans arrested in Paris, in Lyons, and in several other cities. The government, instead of referring them to a jury, sent them before the Chamber of Peers, constituted as a court of justice to judge attempts against the peace of the State, and combined all the cases in one "monster prosecution"; there were 164 accused (over 2000 arrested); 4000 witnesses were summoned.

The accused refused to recognise the jurisdiction of the Peers, to defend themselves, to reply, or even to appear before the court. The court finally judged them without a hearing. The leaders had escaped from prison.

The Republicans, having lost almost all their leaders, made no more insurrections. One final *coup*, organized by Blanqui and Barbès, with the Seasons Society (900 members), fell through after a scrimmage (1839). But some isolated Republicans attempted to assassinate the King. There were in all six attempts against him between 1835 and 1846, the first and most striking being that of Fieschi (July, 1835). The Chamber met these cases with the Laws of September. To facilitate the condemnation of political offenders, they granted the right of judgment in the absence of the accused when they refused to respond to a summons; they also lowered from eight (two-thirds) to seven (majority), the number of jurors necessary for conviction. The press laws established a penalty of imprisonment and a fine not exceeding 10,000 francs for offences against the King's person, attack on the principles of government, incitement to crimes against the peace of the State. These laws created new press crimes: it was forbidden to publish reports of libel cases or the lists of jurors in libel cases, also to open a subscription for the payment of fines incurred by a paper, or to attack the *principle of private*

property. A censorship was established over drawings, caricatures, and dramatic productions. These laws, passed in spite of the third party, were applied so as to prosecute every newspaper article advocating a republic, every Legitimist article which spoke of legitimacy or usurpation. The Legitimist papers, having more money, survived this *régime*; the Republicans were reduced to papers printed secretly. There existed only the *National*, parliamentary organ of the Left, which had broken with the Revolutionists.

Formation of the Communist-Socialist Party.—During the struggle against the monarchy the Republicans separated. Their common aim was to re-establish the republic and universal suffrage, with the Constitution of 1793. Cavaignac, in the processes of 1831, recalled the memory of his father—"one of those who proclaimed the Republic in the face of all Europe." The society directing the party took the name of Rights of Man, and reproduced as its program the Declaration of Rights of 1793. But as to the form the Revolution should take, opinions differed. Should it be limited to a political revolution, which should merely change the form of government, or should they make a social revolution aiming to improve the condition of the poor? The split began on the declaration of rights. Instead of the version adopted by the Convention, Cavaignac took up the form proposed by Robespierre, which differed from it in one significant formula: "Property is the right that every citizen has to the enjoyment of the portion of wealth assured to him by the law." That is to say, property is not a natural right; it is one created by law and subject to modification by law. Armand Carrel, editor of the *National*, protested against this doctrine. The Republican party was rent in twain. The purely political Republicans adhered to the old program: the republic without change of the social organization. They remained peaceful, agitating chiefly by means of their organ, the *National*, and speeches in the Chamber. The Socialist party, composed chiefly of workingmen under the guidance of a few young men of the middle class, looked on the republic as an agency for bringing about social reform.

It was the Socialists who directed the secret societies, and organized the insurrections; they adopted the red flag which had been simply a tradition of the former republic but which became the symbol of social revolution, in opposition to the tricolour flag of the middle-class republicans. The opposition between the two parties was distinctly set forth in a manifesto as early as 1832:

"We have in view not so much a political change as a *social reformation*. The extension of political rights, electoral reform, universal suffrage may be excellent things, but simply as a means, not as an end. Our object is the equal division of the burdens and benefits of society, the complete establishment of the reign of equality." This is the program which in the language of the government and the property class was termed the "agrarian law" or the "equal division of wealth."

In Paris the party was made up of working people in the eastern quarters (Maubert, Cité, Saint-Martin, Saint-Denis) and the *faubourgs*,—the old *faubourgs* of Saint-Antoine, Saint-Martin, and Saint-Marcel,—not the extensive suburbs of to-day, which have formed new *arrondissements* (Belleville, la Villette, Montmartre, etc.). These were then only suburban villages without a labouring population. The members of the new party were not factory hands, but rather artisans, carpenters, blacksmiths, hatters, tailors, cooks. They had at first only vague aspirations—no precise doctrine. The great prosecution of 1834 against the April insurgents gave them one. During their imprisonment together for over a year, the accused went through their doctrinal education; they became acquainted with a survivor of the Communists of 1795, Buonarrotti, the author of the "History of the Babeuf Conspiracy." His book, published in 1820 and as yet little known, was now read and studied, and it made proselytes. The Babouvist formulas may be found in the secret organ of the party, the *Freeman*. In 1829 this party itself took the name of "Communist." The society of the *Seasons* asked itself this question: "Are we to make a political or a social reform?" and replied: "A social reform." The way to accomplish this is to create "a dictatorial power with authority to direct the revolutionary movement."

At the same time that this Communist revolutionary party of workingmen was being organized, the socialist schools of Saint-Simon and Fourier were extending peaceful influence among the property class in favour of a social reform independent of politics. Their ideas did not gain ground directly among the working classes. However, Louis Blanc, editor of a democratic paper, the *Bon-Sens*, later of the *Revue du Progrès*, adopting a Saint-Simon formula, published the "Organization of Labour" (1839). He proposed as a practical solution to establish at the expense of the government *national workshops*, where the labourers should themselves direct their labour and share the profits. This was not

Babeuf's old communism; it was a new doctrine, at once political and social, which began to be called *socialism*—a term in use as early as 1832. Louis Blanc's theory was at once adopted by the working classes. In 1840, in connection with a strike which was going on at the time, Arago spoke to the Chamber of the wrongs of the manufacturing population, saying that "labour must be organized." A deputation of workingmen came to thank him at the Observatory (May). Then the Republicans arranged a campaign of banquets for July 14, and Goudchaux spoke on the "exploitation of one man by another." A revolutionary program confiscated in 1840 said: "These are our principles. We want partnership of workingmen and abolition of the exploitation of one man by another. We want to establish national workshops where the profits of labour are divided among the labourers, where there shall be neither master nor servant."

A German named Stein wrote in 1842: "The time for purely political movement in France is past; the next revolution can no longer be any but a *social* revolution."

Parliamentary Struggles (1836-40).—During the struggle against the Republican parties the government had remained in the hands of the Orleanist Constitutionalists, who had a strong majority in the Chamber. The ministry changed its leader several times, but it was constantly made up of "*Resistance*" men, such as Broglie and Guizot, or the former Orleanist agent Thiers. They governed from 1832 to 1836, except for the interruption known as the *three days ministry* (November, 1834). Then Thiers and Guizot, already rivals, broke with each other, and the majority was cut into two parts: the *Right Centre* with Guizot, the *Left Centre* with Thiers. Between the two stood Dupin's little group, the *third party*. On either side of these centre groups remained the two extreme parties: on the right the Legitimists, advocating Henry V.; on the left the old Liberal party, which, not daring to declare itself Republican, called itself the *Dynastic Left*.

The two centres were pitted against each other for the control of the ministry. Each adopted a theory on the royal power, and the constitutional question which had agitated the Restoration Chambers was revived. Guizot, formerly a Legitimist, secretary to Louis XVIII. in 1815, upheld the Tory doctrine that it was the King's prerogative to choose his ministers,—having regard indeed to the opinions of the Chamber, but not binding himself strictly by the will of the majority. Thiers, who upheld revolutionary principles, and conspired against the Bourbons, main-

tained the Whig theory that the King should choose his ministers in accordance with the will of the people, as expressed by the majority in the Chamber, and leave his ministers to govern without personal interference—all of which he summed up in the formula: *The King reigns and does not govern*. Louis Philippe, while not openly rejecting this theory,—it was, indeed, too clearly the doctrine, admitted in 1830, of the sovereignty of the nation,—did not wish for the rôle of constitutional King. He tried to direct his ministers and to govern in their name. He insisted in particular upon personally conducting matters of foreign policy, which seemed to him to be the King's own special field. The majority having voted against Guizot, he asked Thiers to form a ministry. But when Thiers wished to engage him in a war with Spain, he compelled him to resign, and took as prime minister his personal friend Molé (September, 1836).

The two rival groups then joined forces against the King's ministry. This was a struggle between the Chamber, wishing to maintain its sovereignty, and the King, trying to establish his personal power. The struggle was slow and confused. Molé had drawn away from the two centres many deputies who were ready to support any ministry. When he was put in a minority, the King ordered him to form a new ministry (April, 1837). The Parliamentarians, Royer-Collard and Barante, lamented the decay of political interest. The King was reproached with having interfered in the arrangement of matters which he should have left to his ministers, and of having interfered for the purpose of getting grants of money for his family. People began to talk of "personal government" and "court policy."

At last, in 1838, all the oppositions, the Dynastic Left, the Left Centre, and part of the Right Centre (the doctrinaires), formed a coalition against the "court ministry." The campaign was organized in the press by a former partisan of the *Resistance*, Duvergier de Hauranne, who made arrangements with the organs of the Left to work together. "Substitution of *parliamentary* government for *personal* government—that shall be our watchword." He set forth his political theories in a book entitled "Principles of Representative Government and Their Application" (1838). He marked out distinctly the difference between parliamentary government and constitutional monarchy; that in parliamentary government "the Parliament is invested with the final authority and possesses what modern political writers call the *last word*." This had been shown in the conflict of 1830. "The Chamber had

no idea of dethroning Charles X., and Charles X. did not want to suppress the Chamber. But Charles X. believed and said that as King he should have the last word, the Chamber believed and said that the last word belonged to the nation, legally consulted." The author could conceive of no stable *régime* between absolute monarchy and parliamentary government. "From the moment that the elections became anything but a pretence, the deciding voice must necessarily be given to the voting body." Louis Philippe, it is true, did not openly oppose the Chamber, he did not directly violate the constitution; but the ministry, "by its unconditional surrender to the dictates of the crown," ceased to be a parliamentary government in order to become the instrument of the King's personal power.

In the Chamber the coalition attacked the ministry by proposing an impeachment. The discussion lasted 12 days; 128 speeches were made—the great parliamentary tourney of the reign. The coalition polled 208 votes, the ministry 221. Molé, holding his majority too small, dissolved the Chamber. In the new House he was in a minority and so resigned (March 8, 1839). The coalition was, however, only a majority in opposition; there was not a majority for any government. Two months went by without anyone being able to form a ministry. The secret society of the *Saisons* (Blanqui and Barbès) took advantage of this interregnum to incite the last Republican insurrection (May 12). It was then decided to form a ministry under a military leader, Soult.

The Soult ministry was still under the personal direction of the King, who began once more to solicit an endowment (this time in money) for his son, the Duke of Nemours. In the Chamber, the committee on the measure reported favourably, but the opposition joined forces again and had it rejected without discussion, by secret ballot (226 votes against 220). The Soult ministry retired.

This was the time when the Eastern question was agitating the middle classes. The British government broke away from France and joined the other great powers against the French *protégé* Mehemet Ali. The Allies of 1814 thus found themselves once more arrayed against France. The Left took advantage of the situation to revive in the *bourgeoisie* the feeling against Napoleon's old enemy, and reproached the King with having been too friendly toward England. Louis Philippe attempted a Thiers ministry in order to satisfy the national spirit of the *bourgeoisie* (May, 1840). In the Chamber the government no longer had a

majority. Thiers could depend only on the Left Centre, his own group, and on the remains of Molé's party, known as the 221. He had against him the Legitimist Right and the Right Centre, which did not want a warlike policy; also the Left, which demanded the repeal of the September Laws and a reform of the election laws. To reassure the Right he promised to make no reforms. He tried to win over the Left by personal attentions (known as "individual conquests") and by patriotic demonstrations. He had Napoleon's ashes brought back from St. Helena, he recalled the soldiers absent on furlough, he introduced a plan for the fortification of Paris. (Two plans had been proposed, a fortified wall and detached fortresses; the new scheme combined the two.)

This policy of parliamentary equilibrium and national "jingoism," succeeded in producing an incongruous majority (246 against 160), but it could not bear the test of the Eastern question. The city people liked to see the ministry protest against the treaties of 1815 and take an energetic stand before the world; but they did not want war. When Thiers proposed to demand a credit for 500,000 men, Louis Philippe refused and Thiers resigned. The Guizot ministry presented itself as the preserver of peace (its adversaries said it wanted "peace at any price") with a peaceful speech from the throne. The Chamber, by a vote of 247 against 161, voted a peaceful address. "Peace, an honourable and solid peace, which shall insure the European balance of power against every blow—that is our foremost wish." The Right Centre and the Centre, lately reunited, formed a majority against the Left.

It was during this period of parliamentary struggles that the Bonapartist party began to reappear. Since the death of Napoleon II., the son of Napoleon I., in 1832, the inheritor of the Napoleonic claims had been Louis Napoleon, the son of the King of Holland. He attempted to overthrow the government in the same way that Napoleon I. had ousted the Bourbons after his return from the island of Elba, by showing himself in France and calling the army and the people to him, in the name of the glorious memories of the Empire and of national independence. He made two attempts: at Strasburg in 1836, where he tried to win over a regiment of artillery, and again at Boulogne in 1840, where there was not even a scrimmage.

The Guizot Ministry (1840-48).—Louis Philippe had had ten ministries in as many years up to 1840; in the next eight years he

had only one, the Guizot ministry. In appearance this was a parliamentary government. The ministry had always a majority in the Chamber, and the majority increased at each election (in 1842, and in 1846). The King was therefore conforming to the parliamentary rule of having only a ministry which conformed to the will of the majority. He could no longer, as in Molé's time, be reproached with having a personal government, for he left the government to Guizot, his prime minister. In fact, the King had succeeded in a masterly manner in directing the government in the name of Guizot, and in harmony with him, their personal views being the same. In order to maintain their power, Louis Philippe and Guizot adopted a scheme fashioned after Walpole. Wishing to have the appearance of obeying the will of the majority, they tried to secure a majority which should have no other will than the desire to obey the ministers. To this end they appealed, not to their political convictions, but to their private interests. Guizot's system consisted in gaining the election of a ministerial majority through winning over individual electors by personal favours, such as offices, favours in stock transactions, tobacco licenses—what is known as *electoral corruption*. In order to keep his hold on the deputies, Guizot gave them places or interests in great railroad franchises and in other great undertakings which were being started; at a time when there was no such thing as parliamentary salaries, it was hard to prevent the deputies from seeking lucrative offices: about 200 deputies, almost half the Chamber, were office-holders.

The ministry, master of the Chamber, pursued a policy of order and conservatism. At home they sought to avoid reform, thus maintaining the domination of the middle class; abroad, to assure peace and reconcile France with the other European powers. They prosecuted newspapers which criticised their system. The *National* was prosecuted for an *allusion* to the King's share in the system: "We know well who the chief culprit is and where he is; and France knows it too." Guizot lost the case, but he continued to prosecute the papers and finally obtained condemnations.

The opposition in the Chamber was composed of the small group of Legitimists and of the groups of the Left: the Left Centre (Thiers), the Dynastic Left (Odilon Barrot), the Radical Left—a small group of members (Arago). They reproached the ministry with its policy of corruption, its inaction in domestic affairs, and its friendly attitude toward foreign nations, especially Eng-

land. This opposition was expressed in several famous sentences. Lamartine had already said in 1839: "The French nation is bored." He also said in 1842: "A stone post could carry out this policy." A deputy, summing up the work of the ministry, cried: "What have they done in seven years? Nothing, nothing, nothing!" (1847). After the trial of Teste and Cubières, former ministers, condemned for having sold their influence, an interpellation was addressed to the government; the majority declared themselves "satisfied" with the explanations made by the ministry. The deputies who voted for this order of the day were nicknamed the "*Satisfaits*." To these attacks Guizot replied that it was enough for him to conduct the affairs of the nation wisely; that he laboured to satisfy "the general body of sane and calm citizens," rather than "the limited body of fanatics" affected with "a craze for innovation."

The opposition directed attention chiefly to two questions: the English alliance and reform. The Left, which perpetuated the old Liberal party of the Restoration, had remained hostile to England. They tried to excite the national feeling of the middle class against the ministers by reproaching them with having sacrificed the honour of France. They had two opportunities to apply this policy in the Chamber: the convention on the right of search, destined to put a stop to the slave trade (1843), the Pritchard indemnity granted to an English missionary at Tahiti (1844). The bill for the indemnity was so unpopular that the address supporting the ministry passed only by a vote of 213 against 205. The papers published a list of the deputies who had voted for the indemnity, and they were nicknamed the Pritchardists. Foreign policy was from 1842 to 1846 the principal ground of opposition; the Left hoped to line up against the ministry even the deputies who opposed reform, by making them fear the public opinion excited against the English.

In domestic policy * the Left had not ceased since 1830 to demand reform in the Chamber. They brought forward two measures: *parliamentary reform*, designed to prevent parliamentary

* It may be well to mention here a dramatic episode, lacking political importance, the visit of the Legitimist deputies to Henry V., then in London ("the pilgrimage of Belgrave Square"), to which Louis Philippe replied by inserting in his address the famous phrase: "The public conscience is stained with shameful demonstrations." The episode was the occasion of Guizot's celebrated reply to the Legitimists ("the height of my disdain . . ." etc.), 1844.

corruption by forbidding deputies from holding offices; *electoral reform*, to prevent electoral corruption by increasing the number of voters. The Remilly proposition, that the deputies should not be promised salaried offices nor obtain distinctions, was killed by the Thiers ministry (1840). A similar project failed of discussion in 1842. For electoral reform the Left suggested various schemes. The Dynastic Left demanded the lowering of the tax-paying qualification and the addition of various new classes to the voting lists (jurors, officers appointed by the King, graduates of faculties, notaries, officers of the national guard, municipal councillors in the cities). The Radical Left proposed to give the right of voting to all members of the national guard. Arago and Ledru-Rollin demanded universal suffrage. The ministry rejected all reforms. Guizot replied that there were enough voters, and that besides the number was increasing with the wealth of the nation; there were already more than 200,000. "Work and grow rich," he said, "and you will become voters." As for universal suffrage, he would not hear of it: "This world is no place for universal suffrage, that absurd system which would call all living creatures to the exercise of political rights."

The Left Centre for a long time took no interest in reform. At last, however, in 1845, they joined the Dynastic Left (Odilon Barrot) to demand electoral reform;—a limited reform: the lowering of the property qualification to a tax of 100 francs and the addition of various other franchises.

The country was little aroused by these discussions in the Chamber; the result was certain at the start. The ministerial system was firmly established, its majority steadily increased. The nation was divided into two factions. On one side were the King, the ministers, the Deputies, and the voters (called the *pays légal*); these governed without control and refused any changes. On the other side stood all the rest of the nation, including the King's sons, who were disgusted with the government policy and with the ministers. The national guard of Paris had cried "Long live reform!" (1840), and since then the King had ceased to review them.

The Catholic and Democratic Opposition Parties.—Outside the Legislature were growing up two parties as yet almost unknown to the official political world, but very soon to dispute the control of the government.

The Catholic party had been forming ever since 1830, when the government had officially severed its connection with the clergy.

It was no longer the Catholic party of 1814, semi-Gallican and governmental. The Gallicans had become extinct, taking with them the antagonism between the National Church and the Church of Rome, between the secular clergy and the Jesuits. In France as elsewhere the Catholics of the rising generations were ultramontane, devoted to the Pope and favouring the Jesuits. Their political feelings also had changed. The clergy, recruited from among the people, no longer wished to establish an aristocratic society or to recover the Church estates confiscated in the Revolution. Their power over the members of the Church was sufficient to give them the control of society. The Voltairean middle-class people, in proportion as they grew stronger in their social superiority, were returning to the Church, now once more the fashion. They had their daughters educated in the convents and began to send their sons to the Church schools which were getting re-established. The leaders of the Catholic party, in opposition to the government, formed a liberal party; they demanded for the Church, not privileges, but simply liberty.

The Charter of 1830 had promised liberty of education. The Catholics claimed the right to establish Catholic schools and to abolish the monopoly of the University. Montalembert had begun the struggle by himself opening a private school, thus obliging the government to prosecute him as an example. After the great oratorical successes of Lacordaire, the Catholic party, greatly strengthened, founded a Catholic newspaper (the *Univers*), which attacked the philosophy of the University as impious. The party proposed a new law on the liberty of education which was discussed in 1844. The bishops protested against the University censorship over small colleges. The King held aloof from the contest. He declared that he did not favour liberty in education, but he said: "It is never necessary to interfere in Church matters; if you once begin you cannot stop." He also said: "Do not make me disturb my good Queen." (The Queen was a devoted Catholic; she had personally implored the Peers to reject the divorce law passed by the Chamber, and the bill was in consequence defeated.) The Chamber maintained the University monopoly, and some Liberals, fearing a revival of the Catholic party, which they had believed to be dead, manifested their anxiety by a campaign against the Jesuits (1844). Quinet and Michelet attacked them in their classrooms at the *Collège de France*, causing a tumult among the students.

The Republican revolutionary party was reduced to the secret

society of the *Seasons*, formed of professional conspirators, who were no longer active, from lack of arms. They had among their leaders La Hodde, an agent of the police. Two other societies may be named: the *Communists*, connected with the London Communists and the *Icarians*, disciples of Cabet; but these took no part in politics. There remained, however, a democratic group, without regular organization, trying to bring about a social transformation by means of a political revolution. Ledru-Rollin, the only deputy from this party, said in his profession of faith in 1841: "To pass by political paths to social improvement, that is the march characteristic of the Democratic party."

A group of Republicans, discontented with the *National*, which had ceased to be Republican, founded in 1843 the *Reform*, which became the organ of the Democratic party. Their program, drawn up by Louis Blanc, adopted as its principle *equality*, and "*association*, which is the essential form of equality." "The definite object of the association," it said, "is to satisfy the intellectual, moral, and material needs of the world." It demanded universal suffrage and a salary for deputies, free education, compulsory military service (without right of offering a substitute), and the "organization of labour" to "elevate the labourers from the condition of wage-earners to that of industrial partners." The Democratic party adopted from its foundation a partly socialistic program, and the editors of the *Reform* held themselves in touch with the secret societies. But its influence was very limited; the *Reform* never had 2000 subscribers.

The agitation for social reforms continued to be made by special reviews of the socialistic schools, by pamphlets (Cabet, Proudhon, P. Leroux), and even by the novels of George Sand and Eugene Sue. The movement became sufficiently marked to be noticed in a report of the prefect of police (1846). This report spoke of the "danger not of anarchistic parties, but of anarchistic publications which spread ideas of social renovation. . . . The agitators, despairing of obtaining among the masses by purely political preaching the results which they expect, have begun to propagate certain doctrines much more subversive, borrowed from the dreams of Utopians."

Work of the Monarchy of the Property Classes.—From 1814 to 1848 the domestic history of France is little but a record of political contests. The court, the high officials, and the wealthy middle-class people, who alone possessed the power, ignored the needs of the people; and the people, excluded from the right of

voting, had no way to compel a recognition of their needs. During the whole existence of the "citizen monarchy" there were made only three important reforms:

First. The general and municipal councils, reduced under the Empire and during the Restoration to an imaginary, consultative rôle, were reorganized under Louis Philippe (Martignac's attempt in 1828 having come to nothing). The municipal councils were made elective in 1831, the general and district councils in 1833. They were elected by very small electoral bodies formed of the heaviest taxpayers and those possessing certain professional qualifications. The government still appointed the mayors and their assistants. The powers of the general councils of the departments, regulated by the law of 1838, remained, as formerly, very slight.

Second. The severity of the penal code was a little softened. The law of 1832 abolished branding, pillory, mutilation of parricides, and established the system of "extenuating circumstances" which has lessened by half the number of death penalties. The enactments of the commercial code were modified by the bankruptcy law of 1838; but imprisonment for debt existed up to the Revolution of 1848.

Third. The government had begun to interest itself in primary education. Guizot ordered first the investigation of 1832 regarding primary education, which revealed the lamentable condition of the schools. Many had not even room for the classes. The schoolmaster, receiving only the school fees paid by the parents, often carried on another business. He gathered the children into his room and contented himself with keeping them quiet, without teaching them anything. The law of 1833 obliged the communes to support primary schools and to assure to the teacher a lodging and a schoolroom, a fixed salary and a pension. The school fee was preserved, but was simply an additional source of income. The school expenses were covered by a communal tax added to the direct assessment, and by grants from the department and from the national government. The teachers were to be appointed by the municipal council and had to be provided with certificates of competency. The primary education budget finally reached 3,000,000 francs in 1847, the number of pupils increasing from 2,000,000 in 1832 to 3,500,000 in 1848. The principle was established that elementary education is a public service.

Railroads did not begin to be constructed until toward the

end of the monarchy. The Chamber had hesitated long between the Belgian system of government railroads and the English system of private ownership. After an unsuccessful attempt in 1838, they decided upon a compromise, the law of 1843, which gave the monopoly to large companies under government supervision, subject to the provision that the roads should become state property at the end of one hundred years.

The treasury and customs system of the Empire was hardly changed. The government of the Restoration tried to balance the budget and almost succeeded; the total deficit of fifteen years was only 1,200,000,000 francs (the billion granted to the *émigrés*). The average annual expenditure was about 1,000,000,000. The Government of July increased the deficit to 2,500,000,000, with an expenditure of about 1,200,000,000. The normal state of the French budget under the monarchy of the property class was therefore one of deficits, but of small deficits. Thanks to peace the general wealth of the nation greatly increased—more rapidly than the population (30,460,000 in 1821, 34,230,000 in 1841).

BIBLIOGRAPHY.

There is as yet no bibliography of recent French history. The "Catal. de l'Hist. de France," of the National Library, vols. iii. and iv., 1856-57, and vol. xi., suppl., 1879, in-4, gives a list of all the works in the Library on the history of France up to 1878, a list much too long to be of practical use as a bibliography; it is well, for works published from 1840 to 1890, to see Lorenz, "Catal. de la Librairie Franç.," methodical tables, vols. vii., viii., ix., and xiii.

SOURCES.—The chief sources may be classified under six categories:

1. Parliamentary documents.—The reports of meetings of the Chambers and appendices (investigations, reports, budgets, documents, law projects) have been published day by day in the *Moniteur* and, since 1869, the *Journal Officiel* (in Feb.-March, 1871, the *Moniteur de Bordeaux*). They have been partially reproduced in a retrospective collection: "Archives Parlementaires," "a complete collection of the debates," which is to cover the period from 1800 to 1860 (vol. lxxxv., issued in 1893, goes to 1834), and in an annual collection which has come out since 1861 under the title of "Annales" (of the Senate, of the Corps Législatif, of the National Assembly, of the Chamber of Deputies). The report of the Chamber is *in extenso* (stenographic), except for the period 1852-60, for which there was only an analytical report. There has been an analytical table since 1831, divided into seven series; for the period preceding 1830 the chronological and analytical table of the "Archives Parl." (vol. lxii.) fills its place.

2. Legislative documents.—All official acts are published in the "Bulletin

des Lois," and in **Duvergier**, "Recueil des Lois." The constitutions are all in **F.-A. Helie**, "Les Constitutions de la France," 1879.

3. Judicial documents.—The great political prosecutions before the Chambers have furnished material for special publications (see "Catal. de l'Hist. de France"). Reports of the cases are given by two special papers: *Gazette des Tribunaux*, since 1826; the *Droit*, since 1836.

4. Annuals.—The "Annuaire Historique Universel" gives a summary of the events of each year from 1818 to 1860.

5. Newspapers and reviews.—A list of these will be found in the "Catal. de l'Hist. de France," vol. iv. The leading papers for the period 1814-48 are: the *Journal des Débats*, the *Constitutionnel*, Liberal; the *Quotidienne*, the *Drapeau Blanc*, Legitimist; the *Courrier Franç.*, the *Globe*, Left; the *National*, the *Tribune*, Republican; the *Siècle*, and the *Presse*. The reviews are much less important than in England; they are, for this period, the *Revue Britannique*, the *Correspondant*, and the *Revue des Deux Mondes*.

6. Memoirs, letters, speeches.—The most important are (I mention only the author's name and the date of publication of the first volume):

FOR THE RESTORATION.—**Vitrolles**, 1883; **Duc de Broglie**, 1886; **De Barante**, 1890; **Pasquier**, 1893; **Villele**, 1890; **Hyde de Neuville**, 1889.

FOR LOUIS PHILIPPE.—**Guizot**, 1858-67; **H. Heine**, "Lutèce" (journal correspondence from 1840 to 1843).—**S. Berard**, 1834; **Broglie**, **Doudan**, **Tocqueville**.—**Giquel**, "Mémoires d'un Préfet de Police," 1840 (details on secret societies).—**Taschereau**, "Revue Rétrospective," 1848, collection of the secret documents of Louis Philippe's government.

WORKS.—GENERAL HISTORIES.—**Henri Martin**, "Hist. de France de 1789 à nos Jours," 8 vols., 1878-85; **Darste**, "Hist. de Fr.," have no scientific value.

Of the histories of special periods the most important are:

FOR THE RESTORATION.—**Viel-Castel**, "Hist. de la Rest." 20 vols., 1860-78, especially for external history.—**Duvergier de Hauranne**, "Hist. du Gouvernement Parl. en France, 1814-48," 10 vols., since 1857 (the work stops at 1830), chiefly for internal history.—**Dulaure** and **Auguis**, "Hist. de la Revol. . . depuis 1814 jusqu'à 1830," 8 vols., 1834-38, for the history of conspiracies against the Bourbons.—One can hardly make use of the other histories, **Lubis**, **Nettement**, **Capefigue**, **Rittiez**, **Hamel**, **Petit**, **Rochau**; **Vaulabelle** is good only for the story of the Liberals.

FOR THE REIGN OF LOUIS PHILIPPE.—**K. Hillebrand**, "Gesch. Frankreichs," 2 vols., 1877-79 (Gotha coll.), begins at 1830, interrupted by the author's death in 1848; far the best history of this period, written in a very monarchical spirit, but scientific.—**Thureau-Dangin**, "Histoire de la Monarchie de Juillet," 7 vols., 1887-92, very monarchical, adds a number of new details.—**L. Blanc**, "Hist. de Dix Ans," (1830-40), 5 vols., 1841-44, socialistic, of little scientific value, and untrustworthy.

The most important monographs are:

ON THE WHITE TERROR.—**E. Daudet**, "La Terreur Blanche," 1878.

ON THE CATHOLIC PARTY.—In addition to **Montlosier**, "Mémoire à Consulter," 1826 (on the discussion caused by this book see the bibl. in the "Catal. de l'Hist. de France," vol. iii.).—**De Grandmaison**, "La Congrè-

gation," 1801-30, 1889; **A. Leroy-Beaulieu**, "Les Catholiques Libéraux . . . de 1830 à nos Jours," 1885; **De Riancey**, "Hist. Critique . . . de la Liberté d'Enseignement en France," 2 vols., 1844; "Compte Rendu des Elections de 1846," 1846. All from the Catholic point of view.

ON THE SOCIALIST PARTIES.—**L. Stein**, "Gesch. der Sozialen Bewegung in Frankreich," 3 vols., 1850 (revised edit.), remains the fundamental work.

ON PARLIAMENTARY INSTITUTIONS.—**E. Pierre**, "Hist. des Assemblées Politiques en France," 1877; **G. Weil**, "Les Élections Légis. depuis 1789," 1895.

ON ADMINISTRATION.—**E. Aucoc**, "Conférences sur . . . le Droit Administratif," 3 vols., 1878.

ON THE FISCAL SYSTEM.—Bibl. in **A. Wagner**, "Finanzwissenschaft," vol. iii., 1888.—See especially **D'Audiffret**, "Système Financier de la Fr.," 2 vols., 3d edit., 6 vols., 1868-70, for documents.—**E. Stourm**, "Le Budget, son Hist. et son Mécanisme," 3d edit., 1896, general account.—**L. Say**, "Dict. des Finances," in course of publ. since 1889.

ON THE LABOURING CLASSES.—**E. Levasseur**, "Hist. des Classes Ouvrières en France depuis 1789," 2 vols., 1867.

CHAPTER VI.

THE REPUBLIC AND THE DEMOCRATIC EMPIRE.

The Revolution of 1848.—The chief characteristic of the monarchy of the property owners was to reserve all political power to the limited class of large tax-payers; they alone formed the "*pays légal*"—i. e., the country, in the eye of the law. All political life was concentrated in the 200-franc electors, the Chamber, the ministry, and the King. The remainder of the nation had no share in it. The Revolution of 1848 consisted in extending political rights to all Frenchmen who had attained their majority. At a single stroke it took the power out of the hands of the property owners, converted France into a democracy, and transformed all the conditions of political life.

It was a sudden revolution, unexpected by all save those who made it. In 1848 Louis Philippe and the Guizot ministry, secure in their majority in the Chamber, were undisputed masters of France. The opposition in the Chamber was composed chiefly of the Dynastic Left, demanding electoral reform, but not desiring either a republic or universal suffrage. The Republicans were reduced to two groups; of these one, represented by the *National*, limited itself to preferring a republic without any idea of overturning the monarchy. The other, having but one deputy, Ledru-Rollin, and an organ but little read, the *Reform*, kept up the tradition of revolutionary riots, and demanded universal suffrage as a means of social reform. But it had no other force than a few small secret societies, which were not skilful in making a political fight. According to La Hodde, the *Saisons* had only 600 members, the Communists and Dissenters 500, and the *Icariens* 400.

The Revolution began by a coalition of all malcontents against the Guizot ministry; there followed a series of revolutions in quick succession, with a result anticipated by no one.

The agitation first showed itself in 1847, in the form of a campaign of banquets demanding *reform*—that is to say, electoral reform. The Dynastic Left, which had organized the campaign, demanded only a partial reform, the lowering of the taxpaying

qualification and the addition of other qualifications. Their main object was to excite prejudice in order to overthrow the Guizot ministry. These banquets were simply demonstrations made by the Liberal and Royalist middle class. Toasts were drunk to the King and to the reform. The Republicans interested themselves in the movement; at the Château-Rouge, in Paris, they drank to "the bettering of the lot of the labouring classes" (July 9), and at several banquets in the country the royal toast was suppressed. The government replied with a phrase in the speech from the throne against agitation "fomented by hostile and blind passions" (December 28). The King declared that he would never yield, and the Chamber passed an expression of the same sentiments (February 12, 1848).

The government forbade the banquet of the 12th arrondissement. This was the cause of the Revolution. The opposition deputies protested against the prohibition and promised to attend the banquet; the banquet committee arranged to have the national guard and the students meet the deputies at the Madeleine and escort them to the banquet hall (February 22). The government forbade the gathering and the procession in the streets (February 21). The deputies, with many protestations, gave up the demonstration, and the Republicans, meeting at the *Reform* office, decided to remain away from the banquet that the government might not have an excuse for crushing them.

The demonstration was, however, carried out as announced, even without the leaders. An enormous crowd of workingmen and students met in the morning at the Place de la Concorde, shouting "Hurrah for reform!" The Marseillaise was heard; all day long there were riots which the police subdued without serious violence; gunshops were plundered; in the evening, at the Tuileries, there was a bonfire of chairs. The leaders of the secret societies, who had joined the mob to watch the results, declared revolution impossible (February 22).

The revolution set in the next day, lasting two days, February 23 and 24. The first day's outbreak was a riot by the reform party against Guizot; the second was a revolt of the Republican parties against the monarchy. On the morning of the 23d the fight began as usual, with the barricading of the industrial quarters of the east (Saint-Martin and Saint-Denis). The workingmen armed themselves as usual, with the muskets belonging to the national guard. The government had the call to arms sounded, and the national guard assembled to march against the

rioters. But the national guards of Paris hated Guizot; many of them ran through the streets shouting "Hurrah for reform! Down with Guizot!" The insurrection spread to the western part of the city. Louis Philippe, who always regarded the national guard as the representative of public opinion, suddenly lost courage. He agreed to dismiss Guizot and recall Molé. The reform party had conquered. The revolution seemed at an end; there were illuminations in the evening. Then the Republicans began their work, wishing to profit by the excitement of the insurgents still under arms, and by the barricades, which were still in position. In the evening of the 23d, a band, leaving the eastern quarters, and re-enforced by a group who were celebrating in front of the *National* office, marched through the boulevard, calling for torches. On the Boulevard of the Capuchins, before the ministry of foreign affairs, where Guizot lived, they attacked the soldiers who were on guard; the soldiers fired on the crowd. This was the famous massacre which incited the Republicans to a decisive move. A cart, loaded with the victims' bodies, passed along the boulevard. The bystanders spread the news around Paris; the people got the impression that the government had deceived the people in order to have them massacred by the soldiers.

During the night of the 23d all the eastern quarters were firmly barricaded. The 24th was the Republicans' day. Even they had, till then, cried nothing but "Long live reform!" On the 24th they cried "Long live the Republic!" The drama of the day was divided into four acts:

First. Louis Philippe, having been unable to form a Molé ministry, had during the night made up his mind to call upon the leaders of the opposition, Thiers of the Left Centre and Odillon Barrot of the Dynastic Left. In the morning the Thiers ministry was formed. To Bugeaud was given the command of the army and the national guard of Paris. Bugeaud sent his troops to attack the insurgents in their quarters; but the soldiers, exhausted and demoralized, halted before the crowd on the boulevard. The government gave up the attack and recalled the troops to defend the Tuileries. They then tried to calm the insurgents by sending Barrot to announce the concessions wrested from the King: orders given to cease hostilities, the Chamber to be dissolved, Lamoricière appointed commander-in-chief of the national guard, and a Thiers-Barrot ministry to be announced. The insurgents, already masters of the eastern quarters, refused to receive the

King's messengers. The editors of the *Reform* posted placards with the words "Louis Philippe massacres us as Charles X. did: let him follow Charles X."

Second. About ten o'clock the insurgents took the offensive; they seized the Palais Royal and attacked the soldiers stationed opposite, at the Château d'Eau. This was the only real battle; it checked the mob which was marching on the Tuileries. During the fight Louis Philippe, on horseback, showed himself in the court of the Carrousel to encourage the national guard. He heard the shouts of "Long live reform!" saw that the guards were disaffected, and returned to the Tuileries discouraged. Then, by the advice of his son, he abdicated in favour of his grandson, the Count of Paris. The royal family left the Tuileries immediately; the Duchess of Orléans, with the young King, took refuge in the Chamber of Deputies.

Third. At half-past four the mob entered the Tuileries without resistance and destroyed the throne. In the Chamber, the deputies, meeting once more, received the Duchess and her son. They proclaimed the Count of Paris King, his mother regent, then adjourned the meeting. The mob, however, invaded the Chamber, crying "Down with royalty!" The Republican members remained in session and resolved in the midst of tumult to appoint a provisional government made up of deputies. The crowd acclaimed a list drawn up by the *National*. While the Republicans in Parliament were thus carrying on the revolution at the Palais-Bourbon in the west of Paris, the Democratic Republicans were at work in the east at the Hôtel de Ville. The heads of the secret societies, joining the editors of the *Reform* at their office, had discussed the *National's* list, and added three names of their own—Flocon, L. Blanc, and a leader in the *Saisons* society, the mechanic Albert. They also made a different assignment of the prefecture of police (Caussidière) and the postmastership (Arago). They had then taken possession of the Hôtel de Ville, where they proclaimed the republic.

Fourth. As in 1830, there were now two governments in Paris; as in 1830, the government proclaimed at the Palais-Bourbon marched through the streets held by the rebels to occupy the Hôtel de Ville. There the new government installed itself and divided the ministerial posts between its members. But it was necessary to do something for the men proposed by the *Reform*. As there were no more portfolios to give them, they were appointed *secretaries* of the provisional government, and the govern-

ment remained at the Hôtel de Ville. The next day they decreed that "The Republic is the government of France," and, on March 5, promised to convoke an assembly elected by universal suffrage to draw up a constitution. As in 1830, the revolution made in Paris was passively accepted by the rest of the nation.

J. Simon thus sums up the revolution: "The agitation, set on foot by certain Liberals, resulted in the republic which they dreaded, and at the last moment universal suffrage, set on foot by certain Republicans, resulted in promoting the cause of socialism, which they abhorred."

Struggles in the Provisional Government.—The provisional government was formed by two coalitions: the parliamentary Republicans of the *National's* list (Arago, Crémieux, Marie, Garnier-Pagès, Lamartine), and the democratic Republicans of the *Reform's* list (Flocon, Marrast, L. Blanc, Albert); Ledru-Rollin was named in both lists. The two parties had united to establish a republic; but their objects were different. The *National* party wished simply a political revolution to establish the democratic republic, retaining the tricolour flag. The *Reform* party demanded a social revolution to better the condition of the working classes without regard to the rest of the nation; this was known as the democratic and social republic, and adopted the red flag.

The contest between these two parties began at once and lasted until the end. The democratic Republicans seemed to have the upper hand, for the best-known members and ministers belonged to them. But the social Republicans held the posts of action, through Caussidière, prefect of police, and Ledru-Rollin, minister of the interior; and above all they held the government at the Hôtel de Ville in subjection to the eastern quarters. It was therefore the Socialists who had the advantage at first and controlled the government.

The workingmen, armed by the Revolution, had retained their weapons; having no leaders, they organized themselves by two processes: 1st, The government decreed that all citizens should join the national guard. The workingmen entered in legions. The number of national guards in Paris rose from 56,000 at the beginning of February to 190,000 at the middle of March. 2d, Political societies being no longer forbidden, workingmen's clubs were formed. The most active of these, the *Rights of Man*, was managed by the leaders of the secret societies, Sobrier and Blanqui, the former president of the *Seasons*. In these clubs old Communists sowed the seed for social revolution. The work-

ingmen, being without precise doctrine, but Socialists by instinct, became an army at the service of the party which talked of improving their lot. The Socialist leaders, by means of clubs, gave a rallying cry to the labourers, gathered them in armed bands, and led them to the Hôtel de Ville to present their demands to the provisional government. There the socialist group compelled their colleagues to yield. This plan was successfully followed three times:

First. On the 25th of February an armed troop entered the hall and demanded the Rights of Labour (a formula adopted by the Socialists). L. Blanc drew up the decree: "The government of the French Republic undertakes to guarantee the existence of the workingman by labour and to provide labour for all citizens." The next day they decreed the immediate establishment of "national workshops." This was the expression which Louis Blanc had made so popular. A mob wished to hoist the red flag at the Hôtel de Ville, as the symbol of the social republic, but Lamartine induced it to keep the tricolour.

Second. On the 28th of February a crowd arrived with flags bearing the words "Organization of Labour" (an old Saint-Simonian formula adopted by Louis Blanc), and demanded the creation of a "Progress ministry." Blanc supported the demand, but his colleagues refused to join him, so he had to content himself with securing the creation of the "government committee on the labouring classes, with the express mission of looking after their interests." Blanc and Albert were appointed members of this committee and went to establish themselves at the Luxembourg. There they called together delegates of workingmen from the different trades to arrange their demands. The delegates demanded the reforms which interested them most closely: the reduction of the hours of labour, and the abolition of payment in kind (truck system). Their demands were immediately converted into decrees. The working day was reduced from 11 to 10 hours in Paris, and from 12 to 11 hours in the country. The preamble announced that "prolonged manual labour not only ruins the labourer's health, but also, by preventing the cultivation of his mind, detracts from the dignity of man." The government, however, could not get its decree applied; employers took no notice of it. The Luxembourg committee proposed several practical measures (social workshops, arbitration between employers and labourers, discount offices for small business), but they possessed neither money nor means of action. They could

only hold conferences to which they invited the economists, and organize a committee of delegates from the labouring classes. This, by keeping Blanc and Albert away from the Hôtel de Ville, weakened the Socialist party in the government.

Third. The government having suppressed the picked companies in the national guard (light infantry and grenadiers, men from the middle classes), the guardsmen of those companies made before the Hôtel de Ville the "demonstration of bearskin caps" (they insisted on preserving their original uniform). The labouring classes believed the government to be threatened by the middle class. They assembled at the Champ de Mars and marched *en masse* to the Hôtel de Ville, where they presented their demands. This time they had a political favour to ask. The provisional government had just summoned the voters all over France to meet in their precincts on the 9th of April and elect the assembly which should succeed to the power. The Socialist party wished to have more time in order to convert the electors to its views. The demonstration of March 17 demanded the postponement of the elections, and the government consented to postpone them until April 23.

But the social Republicans, who had had the advantage of controlling the government at will, were after all only a small minority. All France opposed them and half of Paris. Their opponents, feeling themselves in the majority, once more assumed control. In opposition to the working-class guards they set up guards of their own from the middle class, and the *garde mobile*, formed of young volunteers receiving pay. The 16th of April was the decisive day. The workingmen convoked by the clubs and the Luxembourg delegation marched from the Champ de Mars to the Hôtel de Ville in order to present a petition for the "abolition of the exploitation of one man by another, and for the organization of labour by association." But Ledru-Rollin, until now hovering between the two parties, decided against the Socialists. He sounded the call to arms. The national guard came armed before the Hôtel de Ville and received the workingmen with cries of "Down with the Communists!" The mob retired, having obtained no satisfaction.

The social Republicans at once lost all influence with the government. All that they had effected was represented by promises which could not be fulfilled, and by two institutions which the government made useless: the Luxembourg committee and the national workshops. The committee had never had any real

power, all its practical work consisting in the creation of a permanent committee of delegates at the Luxembourg, which thereby became a centre for the management of workingmen's agitations. The national workshops were organized by the minister of commerce, Marie, Blanc's opponent. The Revolution of '48 had produced a crisis and put a stop to business and manufacture. Hundreds of labourers from all trades found themselves without work. The government undertook to employ them; but instead of organizing them in real workshops where each could work at his own trade, they employed them all indiscriminately at building fortifications with a uniform pay of two francs a day. Their number increased from 6000 in March to 100,000 in May. They were then reduced to two day's work in the week, with half wages, or one franc daily, for the other days. And, having completed the fortifications, there was no more work for them to do. The Champ de Mars, where they were supposed to work, became a hotbed of Socialist agitation. More than 7,000,000 francs were distributed to labouring men under this disguised form of poor relief.

The provisional government did away with several unpopular taxes: the salt tax and the stamp duty on newspapers; also the octroi-dues at the gates of Paris. But having no more money in the treasury and being unable to negotiate a loan, they established an extraordinary tax of 45 centimes (*i. e.*, 45 per cent.) added to the direct taxes. This burden fell not only on the middle class, but on the peasants, and made them hate the Republic.

The Government of the Constituent Assembly.—The Assembly was elected by general ticket, in each department, by universal suffrage, a plurality sufficing to elect. It was composed of 900 representatives, receiving 25 francs a day for their services. It intrusted the government to an executive committee of 5 members, which was to appoint the ministers. This was a democratic assembly, very different from the chamber of the property holders under Louis Philippe. The majority approved the policy of the middle-class wing of the provisional government. They wanted a democratic republic without a social revolution. The Socialist party had few representatives in this assembly. A strong minority, elected under the influence of the clergy and landlords, wished, if not the monarchy, at least a firm policy against revolution—the policy vaguely termed *reaction*. The democratic Republicans then assumed control and kept it, strug-

gling against the two extreme parties, the Socialists and the *reactionists*.

The Socialists, dissatisfied with the Assembly, twice attempted a new revolution to establish a social-reform government. They met with armed resistance and the struggle ended in civil war.

The 15th of May witnessed a sudden outbreak by the clubs, the former "party of action" (Blanqui, Barbès), and the foreign refugees. Under the pretext of presenting a petition in favour of Poland, they invaded the Assembly, declared it dissolved, and proclaimed a provisional government by the Socialist leaders (Barbès, Blanqui, Blanc, Albert, Cabet, Proudhon, Raspail, Ledru-Rollin). The national guard, however, succeeded in dispersing them.

The "Days of June" were a general insurrection brought about by an understanding between the workmen in the national workshops and the delegates of the Luxembourg committee. The Assembly, hostile to the national workshops, had at first decided to send back the workmen to their own departments. Then they decided to close the workshops, inviting the workmen either to enroll in the army or to get ready to go into the country, where they would still be employed on earthworks (June 21). The workmen had protested against this in advance. "It is not our wish to be out of work, but we cannot get profitable employment in our own trades. What will become of the 110,000 workers in the national workshops?" (June 18). A delegation went in search of Marie to present their grievances. He replied that unless they left Paris freely they would be driven out by force. The workmen were armed, and controlled the east of Paris. They barricaded themselves in their quarters. They demanded the dissolution of the Assembly and the re-establishment of the workshops.

The Assembly charged General Cavaignac to reduce the rebellious districts, and invested him with dictatorial power. The struggle that followed was the bloodiest street battle that had ever been seen in France. On one side all the working population of the eastern quarters of old Paris; on the other the national guard of the other quarters of the city, the *garde mobile*, the garrison (20,000 men), and later the national guards of the surrounding country,—the suburban arrondissements of the present day,—and finally those of the neighbouring cities, all eager to exterminate the Socialists. The insurgents fought without leaders, but with desperation. Their centre of resistance was the Faubourg Saint-

Antoine, which held out three days (June 24-26). The prisoners were shot summarily or tried and transported. The government suppressed 32 Socialist newspapers. There now existed no longer an organized Socialist party. Only some of the leaders, national representatives, Proudhon, Considérant, Pierre Leroux, made isolated attempts to expound their views in the Assembly, where they were received with laughter or shouts of indignation.

Cavaignac retained the executive power and governed in harmony with the Assembly and in sympathy with the democratic republic.

The Constituent Assembly now began the work for which it had been elected. It drew up the constitution of 1848. This document expressed the political creed of the conservative democratic party which formed the majority.

First they passed a declaration of principles, according to the tradition of the Revolution. "In the presence of God and in the name of the people . . . France is constituted a Republic. The French Republic is democratic. Its principles are Liberty, Equality, Fraternity; its foundations, the family, rights of property, public order." The declaration not only recognised all individual liberties and abolished slavery, the censorship, and the death penalty for political offences, but also promised social reforms, free primary education, professional education, equality of relations between employer and labourer, provident institutions, etc. The first plan, drawn up on June 20, also proposed to "recognise the right of every citizen to labour and to public assistance." But the plan finally drawn up in August suppressed this, substituting a non-committal phrase: "The Republic . . . must, with fraternal aid, assure the existence of needy citizens either by procuring them work within the limits of their capabilities or by assisting those who are unable to work." This marked the victory of the democratic over the social republic; individual rights were proclaimed and social reforms announced, but they were not formulated as a right.

The government was organized in accordance with two theoretical principles: "All public powers emanate from the people. . . . The separation of powers is the first condition of a free government." This theory meant that there were two powers, both *delegated* by the French nation: the legislative power to a single assembly of 750 members elected by universal suffrage; the executive to a citizen elected as *President of the Republic* for four years (probably in imitation of the United States), with the right of

choosing his ministers. They did not want two Chambers, because a second house seemed an aristocratic institution; they restricted themselves to the creation of a *Council of State*, elected by the Assembly to prepare bills for the Assembly.

This was the American mechanism transported from a federal government, without an army and without a functionary class, into a centralized government, provided with an irresistible army and a body of office-holders accustomed to ruling. All the practical force was embodied in the President. The fate of the Republic therefore hung on the question: How should the President be chosen? By the Assembly? That would mean Cavaignac, who controlled the republican party. By the people? Whom that would mean, no one knew. Lamartine knew that the Assembly would not elect him, so he advised popular election: "Let God and the nation speak. Something must be left to Providence." The Assembly, by a vote of 602 against 211, agreed upon this plan. They then began to fear Louis Napoleon, who had just been chosen to represent 5 different departments; someone proposed to disqualify members of former reigning families. The Assembly refused because "a law against one man is unworthy of a great Assembly."

The election of the President by universal suffrage (December 10, 1848) decided the possession of power. The two republican parties, pitted against each other since the February Revolution, had each its own candidate, the Socialists Ledru-Rollin, the Democrats Cavaignac. A Bonapartist party, newly formed, nominated Louis Napoleon, head of the Napoleonic family, who affected to pose as a citizen, not as a pretender. The former royalists flocked to his standard. The peasants had had no political education; they knew but one name, that of the Emperor Napoleon; they voted for that name. Louis Napoleon received 5,400,000 votes (Cavaignac 1,400,000, Ledru-Rollin 370,000) and took possession of the executive power—swearing to "remain faithful to the democratic Republic and to defend the Constitution"; he chose a parliamentary ministry formed chiefly of Liberal Orleanists and Catholics. The Constituent Assembly continued in session though in discord with the President. It refused to pass a law against political meetings and censured the President's order sending the French troops to attack the Roman Republic in defence of the Pope. In the country the new prefects appointed by the ministers made trouble by doing away with the liberty trees and the Phrygian caps.

The Government of the Monarchical Parties (1849-51).—In the Legislative Assembly elected in May, 1849, the position of parties was reversed. Of the more than 750 members, 500 were monarchists, elected through the influence of the clergy and the royalist middle class. Their election had been prepared by the committee of the Rue de Poitiers, the league of the three parties, Orleanist (Thiers), Legitimist (Berryer), Catholic (Montalembert). Of the 250 Republicans, only 70 represented the party which had been in majority in the Constituent Assembly. The rest formed the party of the *Mountain* (ultra-revolutionists), called by their adversaries the *Reds*. There was a coalition of all the Republicans, formed to save the Republic by making an appeal to democratic sentiments. It had gathered together the remains of the socialist parties, which had been disorganized by the loss of their imprisoned and banished leaders (Blanqui, Barbès, Blanc). This coalition had been organized for the parliamentary elections, under the direction of election committees, the *Friends of the Constitution*, the *Republican Union* (of which Jean Macé was secretary), and the group of deputies known as the Mountain in the Constituent Assembly. The programs of these committees promised a number of social reforms; that of the Mountain, written by Félix Pyat, recognised "the right of property by the right of labour," and demanded "a progressive and proportional tax on net income, and government control of railroads, mines, and canals, and insurance." The large cities and the eastern and central departments elected members of the Mountain party.

The majority, in harmony with the President and his ministers, laboured to crush the Republican party, by taking away all their means of agitation and action—their newspapers and political societies, lay schools, and universal suffrage.

The struggle began over the expedition to Rome. The Mountain demanded the impeachment of the ministers for having violated the constitution* in making war on the Roman Republic against the Assembly's wish. The majority rejected the measure. The democratic committees issued an appeal to the national guards to gather for a demonstration. This resulted in the Arts-and-Trades' outbreak. The Assembly suspended the party's newspapers and ordered the arrest of 33 representatives. Ledru-Rollin fled to London (June 13, 1849). Then a new press law

* Article 5: "The French Republic respects foreign nations . . . and will never employ her forces against the liberty of any people."

required a deposit by way of security of 24,000 francs and gave the government the right to forbid the sale of newspapers (July, 1849). A bill was passed forbidding public political meetings. All these measures were directed against the Republican parties.

After having crushed the Mountain the government party began to break up. The President took advantage of a disagreement with his Orleanist ministers over the Roman policy to rid himself of them and replace them with personal partisans. In this way a Napoleonic party began slowly to detach itself from the monarchists, bidding for popularity by combating "the Reds." Carrier, perfect of police, founded a *Social League* in opposition to socialism and had the liberty trees cut down.

Once again, in 1850, all the monarchists united against the Mountain. Their union was nicknamed "the Roman expedition at home." They passed two laws—the education bill (March, 1850) and the electoral law of May 31, 1850.

The educational bill was the work of the Catholic party. The Republican government in 1848 had proposed a scheme of free and compulsory instruction, but the Legislature did not approve even the principle. The majority distrusted lay teachers. The minister called them "the regimental officers of the democratic and social Republic"; Montalembert dubbed them "horrible little rhetoricians"; Lamartine said they were "fomenters of stupid anti-social doctrines." The law of 1850 made teachers subject to dismissal without right of appeal and imposed on them the obligation of teaching the catechism. This law, passed in the name of the principle of freedom in education, abolished the monopoly of the University and gave to individuals the right to open free schools, either secondary or primary. The "congregations," almost the only ones to profit by this liberty, founded all over France colleges and ecclesiastical primary schools. The municipalities received the right to choose for their primary schools between laymen and members of the congregation; almost all the schools for girls were given into the hands of the religious orders.

At the supplementary elections of 1850 almost all those elected belonged to the Mountain. The majority became alarmed and decided to "purify universal suffrage." The bill of May 31 made it necessary for each elector to have three years' residence, verified by the taxing lists of the department. It took away the right of voting from persons condemned for rebellion, outrage against authority, membership in a secret society or a club. The object

was to shut out from political life the workingmen and the democratic general staff; but the law also affected many of the peasants and diminished the number of electors by three millions.

The Conflict Between the President and the Assembly.—The monarchist parties and the President, after having worked in concert against the Republicans, broke apart. The President was increasing his personal power; he had taken his personal supporters for ministers; he laboured to attach to himself the higher officers of the army and the civil functionaries. He held military reviews and made excursions into the country, giving occasion for cries of "Long live Napoleon!" sometimes even "Long live the Emperor!" His adversaries accused the generals and the ministers of organizing these demonstrations. In the Assembly the undecided Conservatives rallied around him, and began to form a Bonapartist party. The Orleanist and Legitimist parties were alarmed and entered into a struggle against the President.

The conflict began over the review at Satory (October 10, 1850). The cavalry cried "Long live Napoleon!" the infantry made no cry. The minister of war cashiered the general who had ordered the silence. The permanent committee in session during the absence of the Assembly protested against the dismissal. The President put an end to the conflict by a conciliatory message.

Then practical questions arose,—the disposition of the armed force and the eligibility of the President to be elected for a second term,—questions which in one form or another filled the decisive year 1851.

First. The military power which the constitution intrusted to the President and to his minister of war, was in practice, shared between them and the commander-in-chief of the army and of the national guard of Paris. Changarnier had held this latter office since 1848 with the entire confidence of the monarchist parties. Changarnier had just broken with the President by taking the part of the cashiered general. The President, having failed in getting the Assembly to impeach him, dismissed him (January 5, 1851). The Assembly answered with a vote of want of confidence in the ministry. By the help of the Republicans this was carried by 417 votes against 286. The Assembly had now broken definitely with the President, but the former majority was dissolved. The Assembly was split into three irreconcilable factions: first, the President's party; secondly, the monarchist coalition made up of Legitimists, Orleanists, and fusionists (advocating a fusion between the two royal branches), and, thirdly, the

Republican party. From now on there was no majority save by coalition and the Assembly could pass only negative measures. The President, pleading the lack of a majority, appointed a ministry without a policy.

Second. The ministry demanded an increase of the President's salary. The proposition was rejected by a coalition of Republicans and Legitimists (396 against 294; February, 1851).

Third. The Orleanists demanded the abrogation of the laws decreeing exile against the princes of the Orléans family. The scheme was defeated by a coalition of Napoleonists and Legitimists.

Fourth. The Napoleonic party demanded the revision of the constitution. There was an article forbidding re-election of the outgoing President; Napoleon wanted to be re-elected. A committee organized an agitation to get petitions signed; with the aid of the government officials they secured over a million signatures, and of 85 general councils 80 demanded the revision. But by the Constitution of 1848 a revision required a three-quarters vote of the Assembly. The monarchist coalition voted against the revision, and the measure was defeated by a vote of 446 against 278 (July 26).

Vacation interrupted the struggle, but it was clearly seen that arms would be employed before long. The President had said at Dijon (June 1): "Whatever duties the nation may impose upon me, she will find me ready to carry out her wishes." The Republicans had organized secret societies, especially in the southeast and in a part of the centre, which seem to have been in touch with a central management at Paris and Lyons.* Some of these societies had initiation ceremonies copied from the old societies (the oath on a dagger), democratic emblems (red flag, Phrygian cap, spirit-level), and a password; they were in communication with foreign revolutionists and refugees in London and Switzerland. The government agents accused them of having stores of arms and lists of suspects; also of preparing to crush the prefectures in the elections of 1852 and create revolutionary tribunals. The President's message on the reopening of the

* This organization, which has still been little investigated, is rendered very obscure by the division into independent and even unfriendly groups, the Blanquist party (*Friends of Equality*), the *Central Democratic Committee* (Ledru-Rollin), Louis Blanc's Socialist party, Karl Marx's *Communist Alliance*, and the *Union of the Communes*.

Assembly declared: "A vast demagogic conspiracy is being organized in France and all over Europe."

Fifth. The President demanded the repeal of the electoral law of 1850 as incompatible with universal suffrage. Urgency was asked for the repealing bill, but was refused; and the scheme was rejected by a majority of six votes.

Sixth. St.-Arnaud, the minister of war, ordered the removal from all the barracks of all the placards of the decree of 1848, which gave the President of the Constituent Assembly of that year the right to call out the armed forces. The monarchist party, feeling the Assembly menaced by the executive power, presented the "proposition of the questors" conferring on the President of the Legislative Assembly the right to demand the services of the armed force and all persons in authority. The Republicans, however, feared a monarchist *coup d'état*. The proposition was defeated (November 18) by a coalition of Bonapartists and Republicans (408 to 300).

Establishment of Personal Power (1851-52).—The President put an end to the conflict by a *coup d'état* on the 2d of December, 1851. He published a decree declaring the Assembly dissolved, universal suffrage re-established, and the French people convoked in their primary assemblies. A proclamation to the people set forth the motives for the *coup d'état* and the plan for a revision of the constitution. Theoretically it was founded upon the sovereignty of the people: "My duty is to maintain the Republic . . . by invoking the judgment of the only sovereign I recognise in France—the people." In reality this was the revolt of the executive power, that is to say, of the armed force against the theoretical representatives of the nation. The *coup d'état* was prepared by the ministers and the generals of the army of Paris. It began with a proclamation to the soldiers.

The Assembly was disorganized. The government had taken care to arrest all party leaders during the night and to fill the Legislative hall with soldiers. Nevertheless 217 representatives, almost all monarchists, were able to meet at the town hall (*Mairie*) of the 10th arrondissement of Paris and constitute themselves as the Assembly. The constitution had provided against this contingency: If the President dissolves the Assembly he forfeits his position; the Assembly takes his powers and the High Court meets to judge him (Article 68). The Assembly therefore voted the expulsion of the President from office, and named a commandant for the army. The members were arrested and im-

prisoned. The High Court met at the Palace and began preparations for the trial; it was dispersed.

Resistance to the *coup d'état* was slow in organizing; it was the work of the Republicans. In Paris the soldiers marched through the streets and fired upon the unarmed crowd; the only real battle was in the workingmen's quarters in the east of Paris (Saint-Antoine, Saint-Martin). In fifteen or more departments of the southeast and the centre there were local insurrections of Republicans, who tried to take possession of the chief towns. These insurgents, especially in the southeast, were peasants and members of secret societies. The government took advantage of this to represent the movement as a *jacquerie* or a communist uprising and to pose as the defender of society. The President proclaimed martial law in 32 departments, granted himself by decree (December 8) the right to exile all members of secret societies, and created mixed commissions (a general, a prefect, and an attorney) with power to judge without appeal.

According to a document discovered in the Tuileries in 1870, there were 26,642 persons arrested and only 6500 released; 5108 were made subject to police supervision, and 15,033 condemned (of whom 9530 were transported to Algeria, 239 to Cayenne after a long term on the pontoons, 2804 confined in a French city). Eighty representatives, almost all Republicans, were banished. The Republican party, deprived of its leaders and its most active members, remained disorganized and hardly recovered from the blow until the return of these convicts and exiles in 1859.

The President, having rid himself of the Assembly, which had held the legislative power, and the Republicans who were preparing to secure it again in the elections of 1852, found himself absolute master of France. He organized his government on the model adopted by Napoleon I., the Constitution of the year VIII., which had "once already brought France peace and prosperity."

The President, elected for ten years, had all the executive power. He was to be assisted by three bodies: a "Council of State," appointed by him to prepare bills for enactment; a "Legislative Body," elected by universal suffrage, to discuss and vote bills and the budget; a "second assembly" (soon called the Senate), appointed by the President as "guardian of the fundamental compact and of public liberties." The ministers were chosen by the President and dependent upon him alone; they

were no longer responsible. There was only one responsible person, the President, but he was not responsible to any organized body; he was responsible only to the people. Theoretically this system concentrated all the powers in a sovereign nation, practically in the chief who represented it, for the people had no way to express their will but by *plébiscite*, voting "yes" or "no." This constitution, however, differed from that of Napoleon I., in that it admitted a Chamber elected directly by the people. This was a concession to representative democratic government in a *régime* of personal government. Universal suffrage, the creation of the Revolution of '48, is preserved and even made the legal foundation of the constitution.

This system, proposed on the 2d of December, was voted by *plébiscite*—7,481,000 voting in favour and 647,002 against. Of the opposing votes 39,000 were cast by soldiers. Then the system was embodied in the Constitution of 1852. This defined the President's powers; not only was he to choose all public officers, declare war, make treaties, and declare martial law, but he had the *sole* initiative in lawmaking, the Chamber being forbidden to discuss any but bills laid before it by him: it could not even vote amendments without his approval. The Senate, composed of 150 life members, was to expound and maintain the constitution. Laws had to be submitted to it before promulgation; but it was not a mere second chamber to pass or reject measures adopted by the Legislative Body. It was the guardian of the constitution, and, as such, had the right to correct any arbitrary or illegal act brought to its attention by the government or by petition of citizens. The Legislative Body was reduced to 251 deputies; they were required to swear fidelity to the President.

Napoleon regarded himself as continuing his uncle's work, but he gave his own interpretations to the policy pursued by Napoleon I. In the "Napoleonic Ideas" he calls Napoleon the "testamentary executor of the Revolution," who had "hastened the reign of Liberty." He shows him absorbed by the desire to establish democracy and to attain peace through war. Now "the nature of democracy is to personify itself in one man." Napoleon, like his uncle, wished to embody democracy and promised to bring peace.

He had kept only provisionally the title of President. In his tour through the country in 1852 he was received as a sovereign. He himself at Bordeaux announced the restoration of the Empire by saying: "The Empire means peace." The Senate chosen by

him passed a senatorial decree proclaiming Napoleon III. *Emperor of the French*. The people accepted it by a *plébiscite* (December 10, 1852). This was a restoration of the first Empire. The power was to be hereditary in the imperial family (the children of King Jerome): an imperial dynasty was established.

The Autocratic Empire (1852-60).—During the first years of the Empire French political life was suspended. There were still political institutions, a chamber, elections, newspapers; the imperial government had had the art to make their power illusory by reducing them to the mockery of serving only as an ornamental mask for the personal absolutism of the Emperor and his ministers. This art consisted in measures of detail combined so as to paralyze all political life.

The Chamber met at Paris for three months every year, to pass laws and vote the budget. They could, however, neither make their own rules, nor elect their president, nor propose a bill. Their sessions were public, but their debates could be published only in the form of an official analytic report, and the vote of only five members could compel a secret discussion. There was, therefore, no way for the opposition to come before the public. They voted the budget, but in the lump, the appropriations for a whole ministry at once, and the government, by transfers, could make even this vote amount to nothing.

All male citizens could vote. The constitution rested upon universal suffrage, and the qualification was made even simpler, by substituting the commune for the canton as the voting district (or precinct) and single-member districts for the general ticket by departments. The government, however, controlled the elections in several ways. It presented in each district an *official candidate* recommended to the voters by white paper posters, at the expense of the state. It made all public officials support him actively. The theory was that the citizens needed the guidance of the government. The opposition candidate had the disadvantage of presenting himself under his private name, at his own expense, and as an adversary of the established power. After 1858 he was obliged, in addition, to sign a declaration of fidelity to the Emperor and to the constitution. All election meetings were forbidden, as a violation of the freedom of the voters; even the distribution of ballots was not permitted, the Court of Cassation having decided that a ballot, like a book, must be subject to the law forbidding hawking and could only be given out at a fixed place. The election was directed by the mayor; all the

mayors since 1852 had been appointed by the government. The voting lasted two days; in the country, in the evening of the first day, the mayor carried off the ballot box to his own house; supervision was out of the question. In places where the peasants had not yet grown accustomed to come and vote, the mayor improvised the results of the ballot. The electoral districts were fixed, not by law, but by a simple order of the government, made every 5 years without any rule. They laid out the districts in the way most advantageous to the official candidates. They cut up the cities into fragments, which they joined to rural districts in order to overcome the opposition of the city democrats by the votes of the peasantry.

Political journals were not suppressed, nor even as in 1815 subjected to a censorship. The deposit by way of security for good behaviour, although doubled since 1852 (50,000 francs in Paris), was still less than in 1819. But the decree of 1852 had robbed the press of all guarantee of independence. Previous authorization for new journals was once more established, and such authorization was granted only on condition that the government should name the editor-in-chief. Press offences were taken away from jury courts and given to tribunals of summary jurisdiction. On the second condemnation the journal was suppressed. The government also secured the right to suppress any paper in the name of public security. It was unlawful to report press cases or sessions of the Chambers, or to publish false news—that is to say, news displeasing to the government. The famous system of *warnings* was established. If an article was displeasing to the government, the paper received a warning from the prefect; on a second offence, the paper might be suspended. The prefects issued these warnings at will. The *Corsican Observer* received one for having discussed public pastures: “this attack may excite discontent among a certain class of citizens”; the *Lighthouse of the Loire* for the following sentence: “The Emperor has made a speech which, according to the Havas agency, several times evoked cries of ‘Long live the Emperor!’” the ground of warning being that “this doubtful expression is unsuitable in the presence of the wild enthusiasm which the Emperor’s words excited. . .”*

* The censorship of theatres permitted nothing with the slightest political allusion, even of the most indirect nature. An opera on the Fronde was forbidden as “impregnated with the spirit of revolution,” and because of the introduction of riots and the cry “To arms!” on the stage. Musset

Even individuals were watched by the police, and a political conversation was enough to brand a person as a suspect under this administration, which, having no public exposure to fear, made arbitrary disposal of the liberty of all its subjects. The caprice of an agent might cause the arrest and detention of anyone who seemed to him dangerous. The comedian Grassot was arrested for having been overheard to say in a café: "This is like Sebastopol; one can't take anything." A woman was arrested at Tours for having said that the grape blight was coming again; in releasing her the prefect threatened to imprison her for life if she spread any more bad news.

The national guard had not been abolished; but the decree of 1852 had declared the national guards dissolved, adding that their "reorganization would depend on circumstances." They were not reorganized.

The University remained, but subject to a *régime* calculated to make it lose its liberal tendencies. The instructors must take the oath of fidelity to the Emperor, and many preferred to resign. The professors might be dismissed at any time, without appeal. Education tended toward confining itself to the ancient languages and the sciences; the professorships of history and philosophy were suppressed. The Fortoul ministry has remained famous (1851-56); this was the time when the exercises in all the classes in France must take place at the same hour; when the professors received the order to shave their mustaches that they might drop "from their appearance as well as from their manners the last vestiges of anarchy."

The government depended on the army, which assured its power; on the commercial middle class, satisfied with being no longer troubled by politics; and above all on the clergy, who made the country electors vote for the official candidates. (The most widely circulated newspaper in the clerical world, the *Univers*, after having supported the Republic, had gone over to Napoleon.)

Under this system political life had ceased. The Republicans, deprived of their chiefs by exile or transportation, and persecuted by the police, had no longer any means of showing their opposition. They had not even deputies until 1857, and from 1857 to

could not produce his "Lorenzaccio" because "the discussion of the right to assassinate a sovereign whose crime cried for vengeance" was "a dangerous spectacle."

1863 they had only five,—“the Five,”—elected by Paris and Lyons. The Legitimists and Orleanists were less persecuted, as the government hoped to win them over individually; but the clergy, by joining Napoleon, had taken away their voters. The opposition was scarcely shown except in the salons and in newspapers brought in from foreign countries (England, Belgium, and Switzerland). The government watched the frontier and searched travellers, to prevent the entry of books and papers hostile to the Emperor.

The leading men of the country were absorbed in business undertakings. The great events of this period were the construction of railroads, the creation of joint-stock companies, the foundation of great financial establishments, the *credit foncier*, the *credit mobilier*, agricultural societies, the World's Exposition of 1855, the transformation of Paris undertaken systematically by Hausmann (1854), etc. Napoleon considered great public works a means of winning over the industrial classes by procuring them work. The only domestic political events were the Republican plot of 1853 and three attacks on the Emperor. The most important of these attacks was made by Orsini in 1858. It was a purely Italian plot, but the government used it against the Republicans. They forced the Chamber to vote the General Security Act. This law gave the government the power to detain, exile, or transport *without trial* any person previously condemned for political offences; and to imprison or exile any persons so condemned in the future.

Espinasse, a general well known for his share in the *coup d'état*, was appointed minister of the interior to apply this law. He sent an order to each prefect to arrest a certain number of persons, using his own choice in the selection. According to Blanchard this number varied from 20 to 41; it was “proportioned to the general spirit of the department.” Each prefect interpreted the order in his own way—some limiting themselves to men condemned at the time of the Republic, others taking those who seemed to them dangerous, chiefly workingmen, lawyers, and doctors. The object was simply to intimidate the people.

Decline of the Autocratic Regime (1860-66).—The decisive events of Napoleon III.'s reign were the foreign wars. The Emperor had the right to declare war without consulting the Chamber. He had employed this right to pursue his personal policy abroad, but his wars and his treaties reacted on his govern-

ment at home. The nation's fate hung upon the Emperor's foreign policy.

Up to 1857 the government had the support of the clergy against the Liberals. The Italian war alienated the clergy; by setting up the Kingdom of Italy and allowing it to deprive the Pope of the greater part of his states, the Emperor had aroused Catholic opposition. To offset this loss Napoleon tried to win over the Liberals. He began by the general amnesty of 1859, permitting the return of all the exiles and convicts of 1851. The Republicans, re-enforced by the return of their former leaders, so far from fulfilling these hopes, found themselves once more strong enough for open opposition. To conciliate the parliamentary Liberals, Napoleon relaxed his legislative system. He gave the Chamber the right to draw up an address in response to the speech from the throne. He permitted the publication of the debates in full in the official organ, the *Moniteur* (November, 1860). The ministerial budget was divided into sections on which the Chamber voted separately (1861). This was returning to former parliamentary practices. At the same time the Emperor, without consulting the Chamber, which he knew to be dominated by protectionists, concluded with England the commercial treaty of 1860, abolishing prohibitions, and lowering protective duties. This was to set France on the road toward *free trade*.

The press restrictions were also abated. Moderate opposition papers were permitted, where criticism was veiled under the form of allusions. The Orleanist *Journal des Débats*, the Republican *Siècle*, and the *Figaro* began to be published. Political life had begun again.

A coalition was formed between the enemies of the Empire—the Republicans, the Orleanists, and even the Legitimists; this was known as the *Liberal Opposition*. At the elections of 1863, there were 35 opposition members and 249 government members. Paris elected none but oppositionists.

Meanwhile Napoleon, once more taking up the democratic policy set forth in *Napoleonic Ideas*, carried the bill of 1864 giving workingmen the right of forming unions.

In the Chamber elected in 1863 parliamentary life awoke again. The minority tried to excite public opinion by speeches against the government. They attacked their military expeditions (especially the Mexican campaign), their expenses and their borrowings (Berryer in 1865 reproached the government with hav-

ing in 12 years created a deficit equal to that of previous governments in 50). Their system of police and of repression were also attacked. (Thiers demanded the *necessary liberties*). The Catholic party, working independently, attacked the policy adopted in Italy. The contest became acute when the government forbade the publication of the *Syllabus*, as "containing propositions contrary to the principles upon which the Constitution of France rested" (January, 1865). The bishops protested; the protestation was condemned by the Council of State. The speech from the throne promised to "maintain the rights of the civil power"; the bishops continued to protest. The Catholic party, having become hostile to the government, made war on Duruy, the minister of public education. The bishops protested against the creation of a course of secondary education for girls. They presented, and supported before the Senate, petitions denouncing the University instruction as materialistic (1868).

Little by little there grew up a Liberal-Imperialist party, disposed to sustain the Emperor, but dissatisfied with the government of his ministers; the latter were reproached with acting each for himself and arbitrarily. The Emperor, who was now beginning to suffer in health, and who, besides, had never cared to occupy himself with home affairs, was not strong enough to maintain harmony among his ministers and to prevent their abuse of power. The Chamber, deprived of all control over the ministers, was reduced to the registration of laws and budgets. In accordance with the doctrine of the liberal Constitutionalists, they demanded a coherent ministry, wishing to secure to the Chamber a controlling power over the government and a means of intervention in general politics. A group of deputies constituted themselves a "third party" and proposed an amendment to the address; this was the only occasion open to the Chamber for showing an opinion on general political affairs. The amendment received 63 votes in 1865 and again in 1866.

The third party demanded, not the complete parliamentary system, but what was known as the "development of political liberty," that is to say, a responsible ministry, common law for the press, freedom of public meeting (in 1865 the trial of the thirteen had just taken place: thirteen political men condemned under the law forbidding a meeting of more than 20 persons). The third party's struggle against the government took the form of a rivalry between Rouher, the leading minister, a declared advocate of the autocratic *régime*, and Ollivier, one of the 5 Republican

deputies, who had entered into relations with the Emperor since 1864. This rivalry covered a difference of views regarding foreign policy. Rouher favoured war, or at least a warlike tone toward Prussia and Italy, as did also the Empress and the Catholic party, naturally devoted to the Pope and to Austria. The third party wanted peace.

After the war of 1866 and the Mexican disaster, the Emperor, feeling himself isolated in Europe and disapproved by even his own subordinates, decided to look to the third party for support. This intention he announced by the letter of January 19, 1867.

The Liberal Concessions (1867-69).—The new *régime* first gave the Chamber the right of questioning the ministers on every act of either foreign or domestic policy. The Senate's function was precisely defined: to examine every law passed by the Chamber and cancel it if it seemed contrary to the constitution. The Emperor had also promised a press law and a law on public meetings. But he hesitated, wavering between the influence of Rouher and that of Ollivier, and finally, in 1868, decided to present the promised laws.

The press law abolished the government's discretionary power, that is to say, the *régime* of administrative authorizations and warnings. A permit was no longer necessary for establishing a newspaper, a declaration being sufficient. Journals could no longer be suppressed save by judicial process; but press trials remained subject to the courts of summary process, not to jury courts; and press offences were still visited with heavy penalties. It was still forbidden to discuss the constitution or to publish anything about legislative debates except the official report.

The law relating to public meetings permitted any seven citizens to hold a public political meeting, on signing a declaration assuming responsibility for its lawful character. It had to be held in a closed hall and in the presence of a government agent empowered to break it up. The government reserved the right to postpone or to forbid any such meeting.

After 1866 the government tried to get the Chamber to agree to a new military organization. The army, formed partly of re-enlisted soldiers or substitutes, partly of conscripts drafted for seven years' service, was a small, professional army. Even by calling out the reserve, created in 1861 and formed of conscripts serving only a few months, the whole army amounted to only 600,000 men. Military obligation was very unevenly distributed, falling only on the poor. In place of *substitution* the government

had in 1855 passed a law allowing a money payment in commutation of the service. The state used this money to procure an experienced soldier in place of the man excused. After the campaign of 1866, Niel, minister of war, proposed universal military service like that of Prussia, but the Chamber would not consent to it. It seemed still impossible in France, as in all other European countries, to induce the young men of the middle classes to perform military service. The Republican party (Jules Simon) proposed to adopt the Swiss system: universal service reduced to a few weeks,—the time necessary to learn the trade,—the army to be transformed into a defensive national militia. This system would have required a policy of peace; it was barely discussed.

The Chamber finally compromised, granting the government a service of nine years in two periods, five years with the active army, and four with the reserve—which was expected to yield a force of 800,000 men. The government renounced the requirement of actual service in the *garde mobile*, which was to include all those exempted from service in the army. The guard was officially created, but remained on paper merely.

The Republicans took advantage of the partial liberty granted by the laws of 1868 to make open opposition to the Empire in their papers and in public meetings. This was the time of the *Lanterne* (founded in 1868, and condemned after its third issue); of the subscription in honour of Baudin, the representative killed in the *coup d'état* of 1851, and of the trial of the subscribers wherein Gambetta made the speech which made him famous (November, 1868).

In the Chamber, the deputies who favoured autocratic government, being dissatisfied with the Liberal concessions and the policy of peace, banded themselves together as a party, and were known as the *Arcadiens* (they met at the Rue de l'Arcade). Their program was to force a war in order to re-establish the honour and influence of France, so greatly compromised by the Prussian victories. A victorious war, they thought, would strengthen the Imperial dynasty and permit a return to the autocratic *régime*.

The Liberal Empire and the Radical Party (1869-70).—The general elections of 1869 definitely decided Napoleon to adopt a new system. Royalists and Republicans were united against the government. The opposition, working in harmony, had, since 1863, gained a million and a half of voters, while the government had lost a million. In the Chamber, the third party was becoming the ruling force. They drew up an interpellation signed by

116 deputies, demanding a responsible ministry. United with 40 deputies of the Left they henceforth held the majority. The Emperor at first granted only one-half; he promised to increase the powers of the House, but without any mention of the ministry (July 12). He then dismissed Rouher, changed three ministers, and finally accepted a plan which became the senatorial decree of September, 1869.

In this new system, the Chamber became a real parliamentary assembly like that of England, electing its officers and making its own rules. It had the initiative in lawmaking, the right to demand explanations of ministerial policy and pronounce a decisive judgment thereon; the right to vote the budget and to discuss amendments clause by clause. The Senate also became a deliberative body, with public sessions, the right to question the ministers, and to make its own rules. It had the power to reject any bill passed by the Chamber which it declared to be contrary to the constitution. The ministers deliberated in council; they were dependent only on the Emperor, but were *responsible*, the Senate being, however, the body entitled to impeach them. Ministerial responsibility was thus at once proclaimed and rendered nugatory.

Napoleon, weakened by disease (he was believed to be dying in August, 1869), took his time in reorganizing his government. He admitted that a new system required new men and he was in negotiation with Ollivier, leader of the third party; but he wished to keep some of the old ministers. Meanwhile, contrary to the constitution, he neglected to convoke the Chamber. When it at length met, he announced to it officially a system of government "equally removed from reaction and from revolutionary theories," founded at once on order and liberty. "I answer for order; help me to save liberty."

Thus began the Liberal Empire. It was not a true parliamentary system; the Emperor continued to exercise the executive power through ministers of his own choice, and the power of changing the constitution through the Senate, whose members he himself appointed. As to the policy to be pursued, the third party was divided; the great majority followed Ollivier, who was content with the new system. A group led by old parliamentarians (Buffet, Daru) was disposed to demand more power for the elected Chamber and formed itself into the Left Centre; the rest of the third party became the Right Centre. The old government party (the official deputies) formed the Right; the

Arcadians took the Extreme Right. After long negotiations, Ollivier was charged by the Emperor to form a homogeneous cabinet representing the majority in the Chamber. This was the ministry of January 2, 1870, composed of four deputies of the Right Centre, four of the Left Centre, and three of the previous ministry. With the third party and the deputies of the Right professedly supporting the ministry, it had an enormous majority in the Chamber to support it in the experiment of the Liberal Empire. It announced certain measures relating to the press, the repeal of the law of 1858, and permission to sell newspapers in the streets.

The Left continued in opposition, unable to forgive Napoleon for the *coup d'état* or Ollivier for his conversion to the Empire. Although powerless in the Chamber, where they controlled hardly 40 votes, they had the advantage of representing the most ardent part of political France, all the large cities, the labouring classes, and the students. The prefect of police affirmed this as early as 1867. "The masses . . . remain true to the Emperor. . . The active portion of society, that which is most interested in politics, is strong in radical and systematic opposition." The Left opposed the Empire in the name of liberty and the parliamentary system; but they were mainly Republicans.

An openly Republican party, the *Irreconcilables*, had been organized during the elections of 1869. It was made up of the remains of the Republican party of '48 and the young generation brought up under their influence. This party revived the traditions of the democratic republic of 1793 and 1848. The majority of the party, who began to be known as the *Radicals*, demanded in the name of the sovereignty of the nation a *régime* similar to that of Switzerland and the United States. This appeared in the Belleville program (Gambetta's election program in 1869). It demanded "the most radical application of universal suffrage" in the election of municipal councillors and of deputies—"individual liberty placed under the shield of the law," liberty of the press, of public meetings and clubs, and jury trial for all political offences—"primary lay instruction, gratuitous and compulsory," "competitive examination for admission to the higher courses"—separation of Church and state—"suppression of standing armies"—modification of the tax system—the election of all officials—"direct responsibility of all officials," the suggestion being that Article 75 of the Constitution of the year VIII., then still in force, should be repealed. This article forbade the prose-

cution of an official for abuse of power, except by consent of the government.*

With the Radical party were mingled Socialists, few in number, without organization and without a party program, disciples of Proudhon (Mutualists), advocating social reform by industrial association, partisans of state intervention, and a revolutionary Blanquist group. But the political contest absorbed all public interest. The Belleville program limited itself to a vague allusion to the "economic reforms which affect the social problem, the solution of which is almost dependent on political transformation."

The Republican party excited public interest by demonstrations against the Empire. The most effective was at the funeral of Victor Noir (January 2, 1870), who had been killed by Prince Pierre Bonaparte. There were at least 100,000 persons present, and they seemed disposed to make an outbreak. Since 1866 there had been a series of strikes in the country and small uprisings in Paris. But Paris at the end of the Empire was no longer the Paris of 1848; it had been enlarged by all the suburbs within the fortifications (8 new arrondissements), inhabited by workingmen and strongly Republican. The former barricading quarters were wiped out or traversed by great avenues without paving stones, and open to a cavalry charge or artillery fire. No insurrection could any more avail against the Paris garrison provided with perfected arms. The street warfare which had once done so much for the Republicans was now out of the question.

Even in the heart of the ministry the Left Centre demanded the repeal of the two remaining features of the autocratic *régime*: the right of the government to fix the boundaries of electoral districts and to present official candidates; and, secondly, the exclusive power of the Senate in amending the constitution. The Left took advantage of this to expose the false position of the ministers. Jules Favre called them "the sentinels who mount guard over the personal government in order to make us credit the existence of a parliamentary *régime*." The Left then persuaded Ollivier to declare himself publicly against the system of official candidature. A portion of the Right, irritated by this declaration, broke away from the majority, and formed a group of imperialist opposition (February 26). Ollivier, bound by his promises of reform, finally proposed to the Senate a revision of the constitution.

The revision was accepted (April 20), and the constitution

* It remained in force till 1870.

modified in accordance with the parliamentary system. The Senate became, like that of all other countries, an upper house, sharing the legislative power with the elected house. Its constitution-making power, created in 1852, was taken from it and given to the nation; that is to say, no change could be made in the constitution except by *plébiscite*.

On the advice of Rouher, the Emperor decided to apply the new principle by inviting the people to vote on this proposition: "The French nation approves the liberal reforms made in the constitution since 1860, and ratifies the senatorial decree of April 20, 1870." The affirmative vote showed at once that the people ratified the liberal reforms by accepting the transformation of the imperial *régime*, "and that they desired to retain the Emperor and facilitate the transmission of the crown to his son." The Republicans declared that they regarded the plebiscite as a means of confiscating the national will and decided to vote *no*. The autocratic Imperialists and Liberals voted *yes*. The ministry ordered all officials to display a "devouring activity" in urging the affirmative vote. The plebiscite of May 8 gave more than 7,000,000 *yes*, and 1,500,000 *no*.

The liberal Empire seemed consolidated by this enormous majority. But the Left Centre ministers, who opposed the plebiscite, had retired. Daru, advocate of peace, was replaced in the office of foreign affairs by an enemy of Prussia and Italy, the Duke of Gramont. He it was who embroiled France in the war with Prussia. The belligerent and autocratic party resumed control of the government; the ministry, constituted on a peace program, let itself be persuaded to declare war in the name of national honour. The Chamber supported the ministry by refusing (159 votes against 84) to exact the communication of diplomatic documents, and by voting an appropriation of 500,000,000 francs for the mobilization of the army. They were, however, counting on a sure victory; the minister of war said: "We are ready, more than ready"; and Ollivier: "We accept the responsibility with a light heart."

At the news of the first defeats, the ministry was abandoned by the majority, a declaration of want of confidence was passed by the Chamber. The Empress, acting as regent in the absence of the Emperor, who had gone to the front, intrusted General Palikao with the task of forming a ministry. This ministry, taken from the belligerent Right, was the last ministry of the Empire.

BIBLIOGRAPHY.

For a bibliography see chap. v.

SOURCES.—For parliamentary, legislative, and judicial documents, and the annuals, see the preceding chapter. Of the parliamentary documents the most important is the Inquiry regarding May 15 and the Days of June. For the newspapers, which were very numerous from 1848 to 1851, see "Catal. de l'Hist. de France," vol. iv. The leading publications of the Imperial period are: *Journal des Débats* (Liberal), the *Siècle* (Repub.), the *Temps* (since 1861), the *Pays* (Imperialist), the *Univers* (Catholic).

In the category of memoirs and correspondence:

ON THE PERIOD 1848-51.—**Odilon Barrot**, 4 vols., 1875.—**Tocqueville**, 1893.—**Proudhon**, 1849.—**Caussidière**, 2 vols., 1849 (details for the prefecture of police).—**De la Hodde**, "La Naissance de la République," 1850; the author was a spy connected with the secret societies.—**L. Blanc**, "Révolution de Février au Luxembourg," 1849.—**E. Thomas**, "Hist. des Ateliers Nationaux," 1848.—The following histories can only be regarded as recollections: **Lamartine**, 1849; **Garnier-Pagès**, 1861; **L. Blanc**, 1870.

ON THE COUP D'ÉTAT.—**Pascal Duprat**, "Les Tables de Proscription de L. Bonaparte," 2 vols., 1852.

ON THE PERIOD 1851-70.—**De Maupas**, 2 vols., 1884.—**H. de Viel-Castel**, 6 vols., 1884; untrustworthy.—**Granier de Cassagnac**, 3 vols., 1879.—**Hausmann**, 1890; **Persigny**, 1896, both of little real value.—**Darimon**, various works, each with a title, forming a series of recollections.—**Ollivier**, a series under various titles.—**Ebeling**, 1891.—**Beaumont-Vassy**, 1874.—**Ranc**, 1878.—See especially **Senior** (Nassau-W.), "Conversations with Thiers, Guizot," etc., 2 vols., 1878, a collection of interviews with persons of different parties from 1852 to 1860, details on France's internal system during the period when the newspapers could not write freely.—"La Censure sous Napoléon III., 1852-66," 1892; reports on the dramatic censorship.—"Papiers et Corresp. de la Famille Impériale," 2 vols., 1870-72; completed by **R. Halt**, "Papiers Sauvés des Tuileries," 1871, a collection of documents of all sorts found in the Tuileries, published by the republican government.

WORKS.—There is no satisfactory general history.

ON THE REVOLUTION OF 1848.—**Dan. Stern** (Comtesse d'Agout), "Hist. de la Révol. de 1848," 3 vols., 1850 (Repub.).—**V. Pierre**, "Hist. de la Répub. de 1848," 2 vols., 1873-78 (Conservative).—**L. Stein**, "Gesch. der Sozialen Bewegung in Frankreich," 1850, is so far the most scientific work on the Revolution of 1848.

ON THE REPUBLIC.—**V. Pierre**, already mentioned.—**P. de la Gorce**, "Hist. de la 2^e Répub. Franç.," 2 vols., 1887 (strongly Conservative).—**E. Spuller**, "Hist. Parlement. de la 2^e Répub.," 1891.—**Thirria**, "Napoléon III. avant l'Empire," vol. ii., 1895.

ON THE EMPIRE.—**P. de la Gorce**, vols. i. and ii., 1894-96, in course of publication, (Conservative).—**Taxile Delord**, "Hist. du 2^e Empire," 6 vols., 1870, (Repub.), still the most complete work.—**Bulle**, "Gesch. des Zweiten Kaiserreichs und des Königreichs Italien" (Oncken coll.), a scientific popularization.

MONOGRAPHS ON SPECIAL EVENTS.—**E. Ténot**, "La Province en Décembre,

51," 1865. "Paren Décembre, 1851," 1868, story of the *coup d'État* Repub.).—**E. Tenot**, "Les Suspects en 1858," 1869.

ON THE END OF THE EMPIRE.—**D'Abrantes**, "Essai sur la Régence de 1870," 1879.

ON FINANCE.—**G. du Puynode**, "L'Administration des Finances en 1848-49," 1849.—**De Nervo**, "Les Finances de la France de 1852 à 1860," 5 vols., 1861.

CHAPTER VII.

THE PARLIAMENTARY REPUBLIC.

Government of National Defence.—The Imperial government defended itself against the Republican population of Paris by means of its army. When the army was lost in the Prussian war the Empire fell without resistance. At the news of the capitulation of Sedan, the Left proposed that the *Corps Legislatif* should vote the fall of the Empire and elect a committee of government (September 3). The ministers tried to save the Regency by bringing up a project signed by the Empress, instituting a council of 5 deputies (September 4, 1870). Thiers proposed a committee. The *Corps Legislatif*, however, had no time to vote; the mob broke in crying: "Down with the Empire! Long live the Republic!" and the Republic was proclaimed in the midst of tumult. The Paris deputies, uniting with Trochu, the military governor, constituted a "Government of National Defence." This government refused to negotiate with the Chamber, and, holding to Republican tradition, established itself in the Hôtel de Ville. As in 1848, the Republic grew out of an insurrectionary movement. But in '48 it was imposed by a bare half of Paris upon all the rest of France, whereas in 1870 it was demanded by a large party which controlled all the large cities and a part of the centre and east. In Lyons, Bordeaux, and Marseilles the Republic had been proclaimed without waiting for news from Paris.

The Government of the National Defence lasted till the end of the war. It divided itself into two sections: the principal portion was besieged with the rest of Paris; a *delegation* of 3 members, re-enforced presently by Gambetta's escape from Paris in a balloon (October 6), governed the rest of France. It was stationed first at Tours, later at Bordeaux.

In Paris the government experienced a crisis like that in 1848. The Republican party, as in '48, was made up of Democrats and Socialists; the Democrats alone had taken command. But in

organizing the national guard arms were given to all the able-bodied men in Paris (over 300,000), which placed the government at the mercy of the national guards. A revolutionary party, following the eternal insurgent Blanqui, demanded the creation of a Commune of Paris elected by universal suffrage, as in 1792. They adopted the *Blanquist tactics* of a sudden attack on the seat of government, and took advantage of the public feeling against Trochu, who was accused of having made a weak defence for the city. At the news of the capitulation of Metz and of the armistice officially proclaimed, the national guards of Belleville marched on the Hôtel de Ville and took possession of it, crying: "War to the death! Commune!" They held the government prisoner (October 31) until it was released by the national guards of other parts of the city. Then, to strengthen its position, the government organized a plebiscite of the inhabitants of Paris, and won a heavy majority in favour of its powers (357,000 yes, 62,000 no). There was only one other attack on the Hôtel de Ville, at the end of the siege; the government, for answer, closed the clubs and appointed two councils of war (January 22).

In the country the delegation was directed by Gambetta, minister of the interior and of war, who exercised an almost absolute authority. He replaced the imperial officials with an improvised set of his own choosing, appointed local agents invested with indefinite powers, dissolved the councils general of the departments (December 25), ordered levies of men and requisitions of supplies, issued proclamations and commands as if he were a king. He worked in the name of the nation's welfare, without control, as had been done in 1793. He met with no resistance, except an outbreak at Lyons, where a body of guerrillas (*franc-tireurs*) occupied the prefecture (September 22) and tried to establish a commune. The federations of departments, which were formed under the name of leagues (League of the West at Rennes, of the South at Toulouse, of the Southeast at Marseilles), existed only in name.

The government called itself provisional; the nature of the government to be established must depend on the decision of two questions: What government will the Germans recognise? What will be the sovereign assembly elected by the French? The difficulty was to get Germany to accept the Republic and to get the voters to ratify it.

The German government hesitated. Bismarck had an inter-

view with Jules Favre, the delegate from the National Defence, at Ferrières (September 19), without any result. Favre would entertain no cession of territory and Bismarck insisted on surrender of a fort commanding Paris in exchange for an armistice. There was still in Metz an Imperial army; the general-in-chief, Bazaine, sent a request to the King of Prussia that this army might be allowed to march out and restore order and the Empire in Paris. The King agreed, on condition that the army declared itself ready to maintain the power of the Empress as Regent, and that the Empress should call on the nation to ratify the peace and the cession of the territories demanded by Prussia. The Empress, in London, on the advice of her council, declared herself unable to accept any mutilation of France (October 23) and demanded an armistice for the army at Metz. The King refused, and Bazaine's army capitulated a few days later. After this the German government, renouncing the re-establishment of the Empire, negotiated only with the National Defence and tried to secure the election of a representative assembly which alone could conclude terms of peace.

The government at Paris hesitated. They believed that the voters would elect a Republican assembly, but they knew that the prevailing sentiment was for peace, and they insisted, for the honour of France, upon continuing the war to the very end. The Delegation of Tours had appointed a general election for October 16; the government of Paris annulled the decree, and sent Thiers to the German camp to negotiate for a truce. Bismarck demanded some of the forts of Paris, then proposed to have the assembly elected without an armistice; the government refused. Outside Paris Gambetta was urging war to the bitter end. The moment for securing a Republican assembly was thus allowed to slip by. An impression got abroad that the election of Republicans would mean the continuation of the war.

The Election of the Assembly and the Commune.—In signing the capitulation of Paris the government accepted an armistice that a National Assembly might be elected. They went back to the forms of 1848. The elections were made by general ticket for each department, the whole number of deputies being fixed at 750. A plurality was sufficient to elect. The deputies were to be paid at the rate fixed in 1848. Gambetta, at Bordeaux, added, contrary to the conditions of the armistice, a clause declaring ineligible all persons who had been officials or deputies or official candidates under the Empire. He thus placed him-

self in open opposition to the government at Paris, which annulled his decree.

The election of February 8, 1871, was held without preparation. The Imperialists, whom Gambetta had wished to shut out, dared not present themselves. The electors had the choice, in Paris, between government partisans and revolutionists. In the country the choice was between Republicans supported by the Bordeaux delegation on the one hand, and opponents of Gambetta, mostly Royalists and dissenting Republicans, on the other. Paris elected many revolutionists; the invaded departments and the southeast sent chiefly Republicans. But in almost all the rest of France the peasants avoided the Republican ticket as the "war ticket" and voted for the "peace ticket," that is to say, in opposition to Gambetta. As in 1849, the majority in the Assembly was made up of men of the old monarchist parties (Orleanists and Legitimists), elected by the peasants. The Republicans nicknamed it the "Assembly of clod-hoppers."

The Assembly, meeting at Bordeaux, refused to proclaim the Republic and declared that they "would await the nation's decision as to the definitive form of government." They limited themselves to the election of a *head of the executive power* (Thiers, the popular man of the moment), who should exercise his power under the supervision of the Assembly and with the aid of ministers chosen and directed by himself. This was the *compact of Bordeaux* (February 17). Thiers chose his ministers among moderate Republicans and declared himself to be without a program, except to bring peace to the country, restore France's credit, and revive her industry. The Assembly voted for peace and the deposition of Napoleon, then established itself at Versailles (March, 1871).

The population of Paris, already wearied with a long siege, were unwilling to obey the Assembly of Versailles, which they suspected of wishing to suppress the Republic and deprive Paris of its position as the capital of France. Two practical measures completed the exasperation of the Parisians. The Government of the National Defence had, during the siege, suspended the payment of rents and notes in Paris. The Assembly refused to prolong the stay-law. In the course of negotiations with the Germans for the disarmament of the garrison of Paris, Favre had insisted upon the national guardsmen retaining their arms; the Parisians had thus remained armed. The pay of the national guard (a franc and a half a day) was the only means of sub-

sistence for many while awaiting a renewal of ordinary occupations. The Assembly suppressed this payment, except in the case of persons provided with a certificate of indigence.

There was in Paris a revolutionary party with a vaguely socialist tendency, made up chiefly from the eastern suburbs. This party set on foot a "Republican Federation of the National Guard," with the avowed object of defending the interests of the national guard and of resisting every attempt against the Republic (March 3). The federation was to be directed by a Central Committee of 60 delegates. The Central Committee, constituted on March 15, was in reality composed of only about 30 delegates, but it acted as the representative of the whole national guard and undertook to place Paris in rebellion, and act as its government.

Several cannon had been brought to Montmartre by the national guards; the provisional Central Committee having refused to give them up, the Versailles government sent soldiers to seize them, but they were repulsed. Two generals were captured and shot by the insurgents. The Central Committee installed itself at the Hôtel de Ville (March 10). Thus the insurrection began.

Only a part of Paris accepted the insurgent government. The national guards of the western quarters adhered to the "party of order," that is to say, the government of the Assembly. They made a pacific demonstration which ended in a massacre. The mayors of Paris negotiated between the Central Committee and the Assembly; they obtained, to appease the Parisians, delay in the collection of rents and debts, the right of the national guard to elect its own officers and the election of the members of the Communal Council of Paris by universal suffrage. The election on March 26 gave a strong majority to the partisans of the Central Committee; the members elected by the party of conciliation refused to sit. The rupture was complete.

The French government had evacuated Paris and the forts, even Mont Valérien, which it had reoccupied. Whether because Thiers thought himself unable to dispute Paris with the insurgents or because he wished for a war to get rid of the revolutionary party, the government had not supported the national guards of its own party in Paris, and had concentrated all its troops at Versailles to defend the Assembly. Paris was thus in insurrection against the rest of France.

The "Council General" of the Commune assumed the government; but the Central Committee continued to sit in order, as

it said, to serve as a link between the Council and the national guard; and there was no division of powers between the two. It was this motley government that bore the name of the *Commune*.

It began by disarming the national guards favourable to the Assembly. It established compulsory military service for all able-bodied men, and declared void all acts of the "Versailles government." It established ten committees, the chief one being the *Executive Committee* of seven members, which was replaced later by nine delegates, one from each of the other committees; each of these nine took the title of a minister as if it were at the head of a department.

The Commune adopted the Republican calendar and the red flag, which had become the emblem of the Socialist party, but it was made up of a coalition of revolutionists without a common program. Of the 78 new members sitting in the Council, only a score, members of the International, had projects of social reform (Varlin, Malon, Frankel); a score were Blanquists, partisans of a violent revolution, without definite aim; the rest were democrats of the pattern of 1793, inaccurately called Jacobins (Vallès, Rigault), Mountaineers of '49, with vague socialistic aspirations (Delescluze, F. Pyat), or perhaps sceptics who had joined the revolution for the sake of power.

The Commune was never anything more than a tumultuous organization born of insurrection. It was regarded both in France and abroad as a gathering of adventurers without political standing. Its supporters, who called themselves *Fédérés*, were known under the name of *Communards*. They were not even recognised as belligerents; from the beginning of the fighting the government had its prisoners shot. The Commune replied by imprisoning notable persons "suspected of an understanding with Versailles," as hostages doomed to be shot by way of reprisal.

In several large cities (Marseilles, Toulouse, Saint-Étienne, Narbonne) a revolutionary party tried to establish a commune, independent of the National Assembly. All these movements were quickly suppressed. At Lyons alone an irregular government established itself peaceably; it set up the red flag, but in the end quietly dispersed. The civil war was confined to Paris. It began with a march of the insurgents on Versailles; but it soon took the form of a siege of Paris by the national army, now re-organized and in possession of Mont Valérien.

The Commune, busied with the war, failed to organize a gov-

ernment or even a police. In the matter of social reforms it voted only certain measures of detail proposed by the Internationalists; it did not even attempt to seize the money of the Bank of France. Its chief political act was the proclamation of April 19, which expressed the theory of government as "absolute communal autonomy extended to all parts of France." All communes should exercise "the rights inherent in the commune: the right of voting the communal budget, of fixing and apportioning the taxes—of controlling the local services—of organizing the magistracy, internal police, and education—of administering the communal property—of choosing public officers by election or competition, with permanent right of dismissal—of organizing the national guard, which should elect its own officers, and should be sole guardian of order."—"The unity of France" would thus be assured by the association of the "communes adherent to the contract"; each commune should be sovereign, and the communes should be united by a federal tie. This was the opposite of the *régime* upheld hitherto by the French revolutionary party, which, following the traditions of the Convention of 1792, had ordinarily favoured an all-powerful central government—that is to say, Paris directly governing France. But the theory of communal autonomy, perhaps introduced by Bakounine, harmonized with the existing situation of the Commune; in insurrection against the central government of France it asked only for the control of Paris, hoping to control France indirectly by the example Paris should give to the other communes.

This *régime* came to an end with the taking of Paris. The burnings and the massacre of the hostages perpetrated during the street fights were without authority of the Council, which had already dispersed. But the impression prevailed throughout France that the supporters of the Commune had made a systematic attempt to destroy Paris, and it seemed legitimate to treat them as criminals. This was the fiercest civil war of the century, and the suppression of the revolt was the bloodiest. Many taken with arms in their hands were shot on the spot. The official statement of the number of burials was 6500 (the true number killed is unknown). The prisoners were judged by councils of war; 7500 were sent to New Caledonia; there were 13,000 condemnations. Those in authority disregarded the French usage which distinguishes political crimes from common-law crimes; they condemned, without precise rules, some to the political punishment of transportation, others to imprisonment with hard

labour as ordinary criminals. Those who had escaped were condemned as fugitives from justice. The councils of war went on until 1876; in that year they condemned 52 persons. The revolutionary party, exhausted by this "blood-letting," was unable to make head as a party any more. There remained only two parties in the field, the Republican and the Monarchical.

Government of Thiers (1871-73).—The Assembly had been elected without limit of term. After the complementary elections of July, 1871, it was evident that a majority of the voters wished to maintain the republic. But the Assembly held the sovereign power, and there was no legal method of compelling it to relinquish it; it retained control for nearly five years (February, 1871-January, 1876). In spite of the protestations of the Left, which denied its "constituent" power, and in spite of petitions demanding its dissolution, it took upon itself the task of giving France a constitution.

It was a time of parliamentary agitation. The Assembly had no compact majority; it was divided into groups: Legitimist Extreme Right, Royalist Right, Orleanist Parliamentary Right Centre, Republican Left Centre, Republican Left, Extreme Left, besides the Imperialist party, which had been strengthened at the complementary elections. Certain independents formed small groups which wavered between the two Centres.

The government was throughout strictly parliamentary; the ministry held office only so long as it had the support of a majority in the Assembly. Public policy therefore depended always on the grouping of parties necessary in order to form a majority, and the decisive question was: Shall the grouping be of the Centres against the Extremes, or of all the Rights against all the Lefts? The two Centres had roughly the same political ideal: a liberal parliamentary government controlled by the middle class and favourable to the clergy. The Left Centre was composed chiefly of old Orleanists like Thiers, who had gone over to the Republic and universal suffrage. Between the two Centres there was hardly a point of difference except as to the form of the government.

The grouping was made in the first instance by an agreement between the two Centres against the two extremes. The Assembly, accepting provisionally the existing government, voted the law proposed by Rivet, giving to Thiers the title of President of the Republic with the powers of a parliamentary king, but making him responsible to the Assembly (August 31, 1871). The Ex-

treme Left voted against it, in order not to recognise the constituent power of the Assembly. The harmony between the Centres lasted nearly two years; it was during this period that the Assembly did its work of reorganization. It recalled the Princes of Orléans and restored to them their estates; issued loans of 2,000,000,000 in June, 1871, and 3,000,000,000 in July, 1872, for the liberation of territory; abolished the legal-tender quality of bank notes; passed the municipal and departmental laws of 1871 and the military law of 1872.

In departmental administration the Assembly established the *decentralization* which the Liberal opposition had demanded under the Empire; it increased the powers of the council general, granted it two sessions yearly, made its meetings public, and created the *departmental committee*, elected by the council, to oversee matters during the interval between sessions. The right of electing the mayors of the smaller communes was given to the municipal councils.

The first step taken in military affairs was to do away with the national guard (1871). "Of what use is it to arm everybody?" said the report. "Against whom? Against everybody, since the disturbers are not distinct in the mass of the nation." The army was made over on the Prussian plan, recruited by compulsory universal service without right of finding substitutes. It was divided, as in Prussia, into four parts: *active army*, *reserve*, *territorial army*, *territorial reserve*, with periodical practice. Educated young men were granted the privilege of serving *one year* as volunteers, with the obligation of finding their own equipment, as in Prussia, but with the requirement of paying the government a fixed sum for the ordinary equipment (1500 francs). None were exempted from military service but Church men, teachers, and sons of widows. The Assembly wanted a three-years' term in the active army, as in Prussia; but Thiers, who still preferred a lengthy service, compelled the acceptance of a compromise, a five-year service; and as it was impossible to maintain at once five full classes under arms, they had to resort to drawing lots in order to divide each year's contingent into two sections, the one to serve five years, the other only six months.

The Assembly increased the revenue by new taxes (on matches, paper, clubs, billiard-tables, receipts, railroad transportation), and made the budget balance, but without making any complete fiscal reform.

The government was attacked at once by the Royalist Right,

which desired to recall the King, and by the Extreme Left, which was dissatisfied with seeing the Republic managed by men who had previously been Orleanists.

The Radical opposition was almost without means of influence. The government, since the Commune, had left all the large cities in a state of siege, thus preserving the power of arbitrarily suppressing every newspaper. As long as the Assembly lasted, that is, until 1876, the press existed at the mercy of the government. The speeches of Gambetta, leader of the Extreme Left, were the main instrument of agitation. He made trips about the country demanding the dissolution of the Assembly in the name of the "sovereignty of the people." He announced "the coming into politics of a new social stratum." Thiers, who had called Gambetta's policy the policy of a raving lunatic, censured this agitation in his official capacity. He said: "The Republic will be conservative or it will cease to be." The Right showed its dissatisfaction by interpellations and by contentions in favour of the temporal power of the Pope, by pilgrimages, and by protestations against the Republic.

For a year and a half the Right Centre accepted the government of Thiers and aided it in its work of reorganization. It took part, however, in defeating the educational reform proposed by Jules Simon and in preventing the introduction of a press law which would have granted liberty to the newspapers. Little by little it detached itself from Thiers.

The disagreement had reference to domestic policy and the question of the constitution. Thiers wished to avoid a breach with the Republicans. The Right Centre reproached Thiers with not opposing energetically the agitation of the Radical party and with letting the Republic get consolidated. It demanded a "fighting government" (*un gouvernement de combat*). Thiers wished to escape from the provisional situation by getting the Assembly to vote a constitution which should establish the Republican government definitively. "It is," said he, "the system that divides us least," "the lawful government of the country"; any other would be "a new revolution." The Right Centre declared that the Bordeaux agreement had established only a "provisional government," and was meant to reserve to the Assembly the right of choosing any other form of government. The Assembly agreed to elect a committee to prepare a draft of a constitution; but in this committee of thirty the Right had a majority, and instead of drawing up a draft of a constitution it lim-

ited the powers of the President. Thiers had the practice of taking part in the debates of the Assembly, where his utterances influenced the wavering members. The committee declared against "the personal intervention of the head of the executive power in debates," and the Assembly imposed on Thiers as on a parliamentary king the formality of communicating by message, after the reading of which the sitting should be adjourned. Thiers submitted, with a protest against this "absurdity."

The rupture became public in January, 1873, by the election of a member of the Right Centre, Buffet, to the presidency of the Assembly instead of the Republican, Grévy, hitherto always re-elected since 1871. Two facts made the rupture definitive. The Radical candidate (Barodet) was elected deputy at Paris against Thiers' candidate. People drew from this the conclusion that Thiers was unable to prevent the victory of the Radicals (April 27, 1873). The ministry proposed to end the provisional situation, which it said favoured the Radical agitation; it brought forward bills for organizing the public powers with two Chambers and a President.

The rupture was completed by an order of the day inviting the President "to enforce in the government a resolutely conservative policy." This was carried by 360 votes against 344, thanks to the little Target group which abandoned the government (May 24, 1873). Thiers, instead of simply changing the ministry while retaining the executive power, a course which would have entailed a speedy dissolution, resigned his office and handed over the direction of affairs to the enemies of the Republic.

The Government of the Monarchical Parties (1873-75).—It was settled by the vote of May 24 that the grouping of the parties should come about, not by the union of the Centres, but by the union of the Extremes. The coalition of all the groups on the Right took possession of power and kept it to the end of the Assembly, in February, 1876. It elected Marshal MacMahon President, selected by the Orleanists to prepare the way for the return of monarchy; the groups of the Left took no part in the election. The ministry, like the majority, was a coalition of three parties, Orleanist, Legitimist, and Imperialist, under an Orleanist chief, the Duc de Broglie. This was a "fighting government," that announced the purpose of re-establishing "moral order," destroyed by the Radicals; it was nicknamed *Moral Order*.

On three vital questions—domestic policy, constitution, and Church policy—the coalition had a common program, at least of

the negative sort. 1st, Not to let the Republicans regain power; 2d, Not to allow the Republic to be officially established; 3d, Not to oppose the clergy. The ministry was thus united on negative measures:

✓ First. In the case of all offices held during pleasure (prefects and sub-prefects, commissioners, inferior judges, district attorneys), it dismissed Republican office-holders and substituted Monarchists. The old office-holders of the Empire were restored to their places. In order to have complete control of the administration, the ministry obtained the adoption of the law of 1874, which gave it the power of appointing the mayors in all the communes (the law of 1871 had kept only the chief town in each canton subject to executive appointment). In order to check the Republican agitation, the government, using the state of siege, exercised strict supervision over the daily papers and forbade the sale of them in public places. It took advantage of the law which required a prefect's license for drinking saloons, by threatening to close every saloon where Republican politics were agitated. It re-established in 1874 the censorship of theatres. In the by-elections the ministry ordered civil servants to support actively the monarchical candidate and practically re-established official candidature.

Second. As regards the constitution the government prolonged the discussion of various drafts. While this was going on it had the statues of the Republic removed from the city halls; in all its official acts, and even in proclamations, it sedulously avoided the use of the word Republic.

Third. The clergy and the Catholic party had full liberty of agitation by meetings of bishops, writing in newspapers, processions, and pilgrimages. The great pilgrimage of 1873 to Paray-le-Monial, sanctuary of the Sacred Heart, under the care of the Jesuits, was a demonstration by the whole Catholic party in favour of the re-establishment of the temporal power. They dreamed of restoring simultaneously the King of France and the Pope-King of Rome. Their solemn chant was "Save Rome and France in the name of the Sacred Heart." The Assembly passed an expropriation act to permit the building on Montmartre of the Church of the Sacred Heart on the spot where St. Ignatius gathered his first followers; this to typify the taking of Paris by the Jesuits. In order to aid the soldiers in their religious duties, it established the military almoners as agents of Catholic propaganda in the regiments. The prefects opposed civil burials;

the prefect of Lyons forbade them by day. The Catholic party managed the primary schools in the communes where it controlled the municipal council. It had obtained by law in 1850 the right of carrying on secondary instruction and it now asked for the right of carrying on higher instruction. The Assembly eventually passed the act of 1875 which gave permission to found free universities, and established mixed boards of examiners for these universities.

Against the Monarchical coalition the three groups of the Left united in a hard and fast agreement to vote as one body on all party questions. The Extreme Left, led by Gambetta, gave up temporarily its own policy and subordinated itself to the Left Centre, which continued to be the controlling group to the end of the Assembly. The coalition of the Left had only a defensive policy: to save the Republic by obtaining a definitive constitution and to defend individuals against the fighting government's stretches of power. The Right aspired to protect order and society against the Radicals; the Left equally appealed to conservative sentiments by upholding the Republic, "the lawful government of the people," which only revolution could suppress.

The Right controlled steadily a small but assured majority of 20 to 30 votes on all negative questions, but it could take no positive step except by compromises with the Left.

First. In the first place it wished to establish monarchy. The old division into Legitimists and Orleanists had been closed by the *fusion*; all recognised the Legitimist king, the Count of Chambord, Henry V., head and last representative of the elder branch of the Bourbons. His successor was to be the Orleanist candidate, the Count of Paris, head of the younger branch. The fusion had been officially confirmed by the visit of the Count of Paris to the Count of Chambord at Frohsdorf, in Austria, August, 1873. During the recess of the Assembly the groups of the Right, the Imperialists holding aloof, formed a committee of nine charged to negotiate with the King the terms of restoration. On all substantial questions they were agreed: the Assembly was not to elect a King, but to declare that Henry V. had been called to the throne as head of the House of France by hereditary right. The Constitution should be, not imposed by the King, but presented by the King and voted by the Assembly, subject to the King's approval. It should guarantee, like the "Charte" of 1814, a constitutional system (annual vote of the budget, civil and religious liberties, equality before the law, etc.). But on a question

of symbol they could not agree. The Right Centre wished to announce, "the tricolour flag is maintained." The Count of Chambord had declared himself several times since 1871 in honour bound to keep the white flag, "received as a sacred deposit from the old King, his grandfather, dying in exile," and to reject the tricolour, "symbol of revolution." It was decided to postpone the decision until the restoration. The Right regarded the restoration as certain, and was already making preparations for the vote and for the King's reception, when the letter of September 27 arrived: the Count of Chambord, learning from the newspapers that people in France regarded the tricolour as definitely accepted, solemnly declared that he could not sacrifice the white flag. The Right Centre had made the tricolour a necessary condition; it now abandoned the restoration and sought to consolidate its own control by prolonging the power of the President. The Assembly conferred on MacMahon the Presidency for 7 years, (the Right Centre had proposed 10 years, the Left Centre 5). This law of the Septennate displeased the Legitimist group, who hoped still to have the recall of the King adopted—the Count of Chambord having come to Versailles November 20. It was the Left Centre that secured the passage of the Septennate in order to escape the restoration of monarchy.

Second. The Orleanist party, already in possession of the executive power through the President, attempted to gain possession of the Chambers for the future. It proposed an election law similar to that of May 31, 1850, by demanding three years' residence as a qualification for voting, and to create a Grand Council appointed by the President of the Republic. The Extreme Right, fearing an Orleanist restoration, voted with the groups of the Left and defeated the ministry, May 16, 1874. The new ministry (Cissey) was again a coalition of the three monarchical parties, but dominated by Bonapartist ministers, who governed in such way as to strengthen their own party. The by-elections enlarged the group advocating appeal to the people; there was an impression that the Imperialist party was rapidly growing, and that at a general election there would be only two parties, Republican and Imperialist (of 29 elections between May, 1873, and January, 1875, the Republicans won 23, the Imperialists 6). The Assembly unearthed a *committee of appeal to the people*, organized to manage the Imperial agitation and acting in secret harmony with the ministers (1874). Certain members of the Right Centre, strongly opposed to the Empire, made an

understanding with the Left and brought to an end the debates on the *Lois Constitutionnelles*, which had dragged along for a year and a half (June, 1875). The ministry, defeated as early as January, 1875, by a coalition of the Left and the Legitimists, had remained in office two months longer.

Fourth. The agreement between the Right and the Right Centre was broken over the question of the organization of powers. The Legitimists would recognise only a personal authority in MacMahon, which he might lay aside at any moment by giving place to the legitimate king. The Right Centre held the Septennate to be independent of the person of the President; to be at once provisional and yet beyond the reach of attack. At the end of the seven years the Chamber should regain the right of dealing with the constitution; they hoped to transfer the power to the Duc d'Aumale. By the rupture the Monarchist coalition lost its power of determining at will the form of government for France. The Assembly rejected the proposition of the Left, declaring that "the government of the Republic consists of two Chambers and a President"; but as some solution was a necessity, a small group, deserting the Right Centre, joined the Left and carried, by a majority of one, the amendment offered by Wallon, which, by giving to the executive the title *President of the Republic*, recognised by implication the Republic as the definitive government of France (January 30, 1875).

Fifth. Then provision was made for a Senate. The Orleanist party was unable to carry the appointment of the Senators by the President; but it succeeded in defeating the proposition of the Left, that they should be elected by universal suffrage. It further obtained a decision that seventy-five of its members should be elected for life by the Assembly. The Left Centre proposed to the Right Centre an agreement as to the members to be elected; it asked for the Left only thirty of the seventy-five; the Right Centre was not willing to grant more than thirteen. But the Imperialist party, fearing the preponderance of the Orleanists, refused to vote for their candidates. On the second day of the voting they came to an understanding with the Left: they detached fifteen *chevaulégers* (Legitimists) from the majority by offering them seats in the Senate. This coalition succeeded in electing fifty-eight of the seventy-five senators from the Left, with nine Legitimists, against eight candidates of the Right. The Buffet ministry, formed March, 1875, by understanding between the two Centres, still held office in opposition to the Republicans.

The Constitution of 1875.—The system established by the Assembly in 1875 was the result of a compromise, as no majority could be found to support any complete constitution. To speak accurately, there is no constitution of 1875 in the sense of the previous French constitutions. We use the word, however, of the Septennate law of 1873 and the three *lois constitutionnelles* of 1875 taken together, and completed by various organic laws relative to the election of senators and representatives. These must still be interpreted by means of the two laws of 1871 and 1873 which had regulated the powers of Thiers.

The whole organization is that of a constitutional monarchy on the Belgian model. The President of the Republic, elected for seven years, holds the position of a constitutional King; he has the same powers, even the right of pardon, and he is similarly forbidden to exercise any of them in person. All his public acts must be performed through ministers; he is personally irresponsible; he has the right of dissolving the Chamber, but only with the approval of the Senate.

The ministers, who exercise the real power, form, as in England, a ministry united and responsible in presence of the Chambers. That which in England is only usage, is in France written as a formal rule of the constitution, and the position of head of the council, which in England exists only as a fact, has a similar recognition. Responsibility, as in all parliamentary countries, implies the power of the Chambers, not only to judge the ministers, but to compel them to resign by a simple vote.*

As this power cannot be practically exercised by two Chambers at once it is considered as reserved exclusively for the lower house. This is the interpretation which has prevailed in France, even after the conflict of 1896. Sovereignty is thus indirectly exercised by the lower house, which controls the fate of the ministers.

The ministers are appointed by the President; the law of 1871

* The law does not explain whether the word responsible is to be taken in its old legal sense or in its new political sense. Responsibility in the old sense was enforced by the judicial process of impeachment. Political responsibility, on the other hand, is enforced by a simple vote of the representative Chamber. The Assembly of 1875 admitted at once both sorts of responsibility, but in designating both by a single word it confounded them together in one phrase: "The ministers are responsible in presence of the Chambers," using the plural, which applies well to the case where ministers are impeached by one Chamber before the other, but not to the case where they are simply defeated in the popular Chamber.

even says that they are dismissed by him; but parliamentary usage does not permit him to appoint them outside the parliamentary majority, nor to use the right of dismissal; they leave office only by resignation. As no process is indicated for determining when ministers must resign, they themselves must decide the matter. In practice, the ministers have shown themselves very respectful to the Chamber and have resigned as soon as they have been left in minority, without waiting for a vote of want of confidence. Of the provisional scheme established for Thiers in 1871, a scrap has been preserved which is contrary to the usage of parliamentary countries, namely, the right of the President of the Republic to preside in the Council of Ministers.*

The legislative power in its most extended sense, including the right to vote war, peace, treaties, to interpellate the ministers, the right of inquest, the right of initiative for every member, is shared by two assemblies: a Chamber of Deputies, elected by universal suffrage, and renewed as a body every four years; a Senate of 300 members, one-fourth elected for life by the Assembly, vacancies in the list of life members to be filled by the Senate itself; three-fourths to consist of members elected for nine years by electoral colleges in the departments. In these colleges delegates from the municipal councils; one for each commune, were the preponderating element.†

The Right Centre, in giving up the appointment of senators by the President, had insisted on equal representation of all the communes in the electoral colleges, in order to insure the predominance of the little country communes. The law attributes exactly the same powers to the two Chambers, except that the budget must be voted in the first instance by the Chamber, and the Senate has the right of voting the dissolution of the Chamber on the request of the President; also the right to sit as a court of justice for trial of political offenders. The Chambers have a legal right to one session of five months yearly; the President

* The French ministers meet for confidential conference in *conseil du cabinet*, without the presence of the President of the Republic; but for formal action as a *conseil des ministres* they need the President of the Republic in the chair. The two forms of meeting are not essentially different from the two forms of meeting used by the English Ministers; first, when they meet for consultation as a Cabinet without the sovereign; and, secondly, when they meet for formal action as a Privy Council, in presence of the sovereign. The meeting for formal action is in both countries recognised by the law. See ESMEIN, *Droit Constitutionnel*, p. 615.—Tr.

† The senatorial elections were materially changed in 1884 (see p. 209).

may adjourn them for the rest of the year, and during their recess he stands alone. The right of setting up a permanent committee by his side was abandoned.

The meeting of the two Chambers constitutes the National Assembly, which alone is sovereign. This elects the President and has the power of revising the constitution; but the revision can be undertaken only after a *separate* vote of each Chamber agreeing to hold the joint meeting.

The Council of State is simply a body of officers designated by the government.

Of the English Parliamentary system, the French have thus preserved the three powers, the irresponsible sovereign, the united and responsible ministry, the right of dissolution and the two houses; but to these they have added democratic innovations: 1st, The sovereign is elected, and for a limited term: he has not the full power of dissolution. 2d, The upper house is elected and is not confined to the mere passage of bills. 3d, The lower house is elected by universal suffrage. 4th, The members of the houses receive pay for their services, and the senatorial electors receive travelling expenses. This is a compromise between the English Parliamentary monarchy and the democratic system adopted for France by the Convention (1793). In practice it has leaned more to the democratic system. The Chamber, elected by universal suffrage, has become the dominant power, because it controls the ministry. The President has confined his personal rôle to representing the government on ceremonial occasions, to designating the head of each ministry, and to presiding at the Council of Ministers. The Senate has made little use of its right of initiative; it has rarely proposed laws, and has confined itself to a right of veto on bills proposed by the Chamber. It has adopted the practice of accepting, without serious changes, the budget prepared by the Chamber, contenting itself with preventing the suppression of public services by mere action on the budget. Thus has been established the political constitution which France had vainly been striving for since 1789. There are now recognised in France principles of government which no party any longer contests: the sovereignty of the nation exercised through the Chamber, universal suffrage, liberty of the press, trial by jury, and right of public meeting. Under this political constitution the social organization created by the Revolution, and the administrative system created by Napoleon are both preserved.

Struggle between the President and the Chamber (1876-79).—President MacMahon, elected by the Monarchist Right, thought himself bound in honour to govern according to the ideas of the Right. The Chamber, elected by universal suffrage, had a large majority of Republicans,—360 against 170,—the Senate, elected before the Chamber, by the electoral colleges of the departments, in which the municipal councils of the country communes had the control, was at first about equally divided (thanks to the Republican majority of life senators elected by the Assembly); later the Right had a majority of a few votes. The grouping of the parties, formed in 1873 on the question of the Republic, continued; but the parties had changed their attitude. The Republican party, divided into three groups,—Left Centre, Republican Left (most numerous), and Radical Left,—took the offensive to compel the President to adopt a Republican policy. The old monarchical party, now become the *conservative* party, was thrown on the defensive. It was in three groups: Right, Right Centre, and Popular Appeal (the Extreme Right had disappeared). Unable now to dispute the constitution, these groups sought, in the name of the interests of society, to keep conservative office-holders in their places—the thing called “the Republic without Republicans.”

The question of the constitution being finally settled, the contest turned on the possession of power, the guarantees of public liberty, and the policy toward the Church. The Left began by asking for a Republican ministry. MacMahon accepted a ministry of the Left Centre (Dufaure in March, 1876, and later in the year Jules Simon); but he held three ministerial offices—War, Navy, and Foreign Affairs—to be outside of politics.

As to the civil services, the Left demanded a purge, that is to say, the dismissal of office-holders openly hostile to the Republic. The ministry effected this more or less completely.

In order to establish freedom of elections the Chamber condemned official candidatures by systematically refusing to admit deputies elected by the help of the office-holders or the clergy. It re-established freedom of the press and the right to sell newspapers in public. It passed the Act of 1876, which restored to the municipal councils, except in the case of the chief town of each canton, the right of electing the mayor. The clergy had canvassed against the Republicans; the Left declared itself opposed to the influence of the clergy. The ministry prepared bills to exclude members of religious orders from teaching in the primary schools and to withdraw from the Catholic universities the

right of preparing students for the state examinations. The Chamber refused to vote money for the military almoners (see p. 198). The Catholic party drew up a petition to the President of the Republic, asking him to support the Pope against Italy, with the object of re-establishing the temporal power. The Chamber replied by a resolution against the ultramontane agitation (May 4, 1877). This was the occasion of the rupture with the President.

MacMahon, while accepting Republican ministers, continued to consult his political friends, his former ministers, leaders of the Conservative party. They persuaded him to rid himself of the Republican Chamber before the autumn municipal elections, upon the outcome of which depended the approaching renewal of the Senate. MacMahon dismissed the Simon ministry (May 16), took a Conservative ministry (Broglie-Fourtou), adjourned the Chamber for a month, then dissolved it with the consent of the Senate.

May 16 meant political war between the President and Senate on the one hand, and the Republican power, the Chamber, on the other. The constitution placed the Chamber and the ministry at the discretion of the President and Senate, and the Conservative party took advantage of this to regain power. In order to keep office as long as possible the ministry extended by three weeks the period within which the constitution required the electors to meet, and thus got for itself five months of power. It used these five months in preparing for the elections; it changed at a stroke the whole administrative body, and appointed new "fighting officials"; it embarrassed by prohibitions or prosecutions the sale of Republican journals, political meetings, and agitation for the Republic; it suspended Republican municipal councils, substituting for them municipal commissioners. At the elections it presented official candidates, indorsed by the President of the Republic, and published Presidential manifestoes to the French people. In these MacMahon, abandoning his rôle of the irresponsible sovereign, assumed officially a position opposed to the Republicans and announced his purpose "to fight it out to the last," even against the will of the voters. The clergy supported the official candidates, and preached against the Republicans.

The Left, thrown on the defensive anew, forgot its differences and drew together as a homogeneous party. All the deputies who supported the vote of May 16 (the 363) presented themselves

with a common platform. The Republican senators chose a committee for common action. Their cue was to pose as conservatives, as defenders of the Republic against the revolutionary coalition of monarchists and clergy—as defenders of the sovereignty of the people against the personal power of the President. Gambetta launched two famous phrases: "Our foe is clericalism" (*Le cléricalisme voilà l'ennemi*), "When the country shall have spoken, he must either submit or resign" (*Quand le pays aura parlé, il faudra se soumettre ou se démettre*). The Republicans also used with the voters the fear of war with Italy, urged by the Catholic supporters of the temporal power.

The elections of October, 1877, returned about 330 Republicans against 210 Conservatives. The ministry resigned. The Conservative party hesitated as to its future course. The President tried a "business ministry" (Rochebouet), chosen outside of the Chambers, but within the Conservative party. The Chamber declined to recognise this ministry (November 24). The Senate did not dare to approve a second dissolution; the budget had not been voted and, in order to do without the Chamber, it would have been necessary to levy taxes without legal authority, and to use force against citizens who should resist. There were Conservatives ready to form a ministry with this program, but MacMahon would have no *coup d'état*, preferring to submit. He formed a ministry of the Left Centre, wholly Republican (December, 1877). This was the final overthrow of the Conservative party.

The Republicans resumed power. The ministry restored the office-holders dismissed by the ministry of May 16, and the Chamber quashed more than 50 elections made under administrative or clerical pressure. The elections to fill these vacancies brought up the number of Republicans to 370. The party was still united; the exposition of 1878 was distracting attention from politics. Gambetta advised the Radicals to cultivate union, discipline, and patience, saying that they must settle questions one by one (December, 1878). Finally, at the renewal of one-third of the Senate, the Republicans acquired a strong majority in that body (178 against 126). MacMahon, isolated and reluctant to make certain army appointments asked for by his Republican ministers, handed in his resignation and was followed by a Radical, Grévy (January, 1879). The Republicans thus acquired, and have retained, control of the three organs of political power.

Supremacy and Changes of the Republican Party (1879-84).—

The Republicans, united for defence, fell apart again when it came to governing. The Left Centre had had the power because it could get on with MacMahon, but it was weak with the electors. From this time forward it was only an insignificant group in the Chamber. Its strength lay in the Senate, where, by uniting with the Right, it formed until 1882 a Catholic majority, which defeated the measures of the Chamber against the clergy. In the Chamber the majority belonged to two groups, the Republican Left and the former Extreme Left (Gambetta's party, now become the Republican Union). But a new Extreme Left was formed, which reproached Gambetta and his followers with abandoning Radical principles for a policy of opportunism. The majority began by ousting the Dufaure ministry (Left Centre) because it refused to dismiss all Monarchists from office. Power passed to the Left, which formed several ministries in succession, each made up more largely from the Extreme Left than its predecessor (Waddington, January, 1880; Freycinet, December, 1880; Ferry, 1881).

The government carried the transfer of the Chambers from Versailles to Paris (June, 1880) and the institution of the National Festival of July 14. It announced a series of projects: some to realize a part of the old radical program: freedom of the press and of public meeting, universal election of the mayors by the municipal councils, purchase of all railways by the State, and above all free and compulsory primary education by lay teachers. Other measures were directed against the Catholic party: to withdraw the corporate quality from bishoprics, to suppress Church cemeteries, to abolish the military almoners, to deprive the Catholic universities of the name "university" and the right of presenting for degrees. In proposing the bill regulating higher education, the Minister of Instruction (Ferry) added the famous *Article 7*, which forbade members of unauthorized religious orders to take part in secondary education—the object being to destroy the Jesuit colleges.

The positive measures encountered the passive resistance of the Senate, where the Left Centre, in alliance with the Conservatives, defeated the bills passed by the Chamber. It accepted only the bill relating to the Catholic universities, without *Article 7* (March, 1880). The government replied by issuing decrees which called out of abeyance certain old unrepealed laws against "unauthorized congregations," and ordered all such bodies to disperse. The congregations refused to obey, and the govern-

ment expelled them by force. This was the final breach between the Republic and the Catholic clergy.

The resistance of the Right grew weaker with the progress of time; the government bills were eventually passed, some of them bit by bit: the law as to election of the mayors in 1882, that making the sessions of municipal councils public in 1884. Primary education was regulated by a series of acts passed between 1881 and 1886: the act making education gratuitous in 1881, that making it compulsory and by lay teachers in 1882. Secondary education for girls had been regulated by an act of 1880. A law of 1881 established complete freedom of the press, without restrictions in the form of money deposit, license, or stamp duty, and with jury trial for all press offences; this was the system demanded by the Radical party. Complete liberty of public meeting was established, but not liberty of political clubs. In 1884 the law on professional *syndicates* at last secured to workmen the right to found societies like the English trade unions.

At the same time the ministers were struggling against the Extreme Left in its demands for the dismissal of non-Republican judges, for amnesty for the Communards, and for amendment of the constitution. But this opposition grew steadily stronger; the ministers yielded little by little. In 1880 they voted the amnesty (preceded by individual pardons *) which permitted the return to France of proscribed Communists and gave the revolutionary Socialists a chance to organize themselves as a party once more. In 1882 the dismissal of judges was brought about by a law which suspended the irremovability of judges for six months, and thus allowed the government to retire Conservative magistrates. Then the government proposed a partial revision of the constitution, to which the Senate eventually agreed (1884). The 75 life senatorships were to be abolished: as vacancies should occur in the list they were to be filled by the election of ordinary senators, with nine-year terms—the election to be by the departments. The number of senatorial electors in each department was increased by assigning to each municipal council a number of delegates varying from 1 to 24, according to the population of the commune. This diminished the inequality of representation in these elections. It still left, however, an advantage in the hands of the rural communes.

* According to French practice, executive pardon (*grace*) simply remits the active punishment of the offender, without restoring him to his rights as a citizen. For this latter a legislative act of amnesty is necessary.—TR.

After the elections of 1881 the Chamber had 457 Republicans against 88 Conservatives. In the Senate, after the renewal of 1882, there were 205 Republicans (30 belonging to the Left Centre) against 95 Conservatives. The Conservative party gave up the political contest.* The Republican party underwent a change, the majority joining the Republican Union. Gambetta, leader of the majority, agreed to take charge of the government and formed "the great ministry," which had been long expected as the incarnation of the Republican party (November, 1881). But instead of inviting all the chiefs of the Left to join him, Gambetta formed his ministry of men of his own group exclusively. He then proposed to amend the constitutional laws by inserting a clause requiring the Chamber to be elected by *general ticket*; the electoral system had been kept out of the constitution in order that it might be modified at any time by ordinary law. The Republican party divided. The Extreme Left had long upbraided Gambetta for his opportunist policy (he had, during the campaign of 1881, made a violent attack upon his adversaries, in his district of Belleville). The Left reproached him with his kingly airs,—referring to his triumphal entry into his native town, Cahors,—with his authoritative language (his "speech from the throne" to the Chamber), and his tendency to surround himself with his personal devotees. The malcontents joined forces against him and defeated his revision scheme of general ticket by a large majority. Gambetta resigned, having lost his popularity in three months (January, 1882); he died in December, 1882, without having regained it.

Once more the government fell into the hands of ministries of the Left supported by the Republican Union: Freycinet, then Duclerc, and lastly Ferry, the longest-lived ministry of the Parliamentary Republic (February, 1883, to May, 1885). The Radical party on attaining power had abandoned its great reforms. Instead of the election of judges (voted as one of its principles in 1883) it limited itself to a purging process. Instead of state purchase of railroads it made "deals" with the large companies (1883). It abandoned the income tax which it had demanded in 1874. Of its former platform it preserved only the

* Since the death of the Prince Imperial, killed by the Zulus in 1879, the Imperialists had been divided: the supporters of the direct heir, Prince Jerome, and the supporters of his son Prince Victor, the latter being favoured by the Empress and the Catholics.

reform of primary instruction (accomplished in 1886), and the reform of the military service, which the Senate rejected. It concentrated its efforts on its colonial policy. It strove to give France once more an empire outside of Europe (Tunis, Soudan, Congo, Tonquin, and Annam) in order to open up markets for French commerce.

Division of the Republican Party and Reconstitution of the Conservative Party (1884-87).—The Republican party at last broke into two hostile factions. The Left and the Republican Union formed the Republican party, supporting the government. They were known as the *Opportunists*. The Extreme Left, taking the old name, formerly common to all Republicans, became the *Radical* party. The two parties were divided by personal rivalries rather than by a difference in principles. The Radicals were those who, having taken no part in Gambetta's personal following and having opposed Ferry's colonial policy, had been shut out of the government. But in resuming the portions of the old Radical platform which the Republicans had dropped when they attained power, the Radicals gave themselves a "fighting platform." They demanded revision of the constitution in order to deprive the Senate of the right of voting the budget and dissolving the Chamber; the separation of Church and State, and the abolition of the Concordat, now defended by the Opportunists; reform of the fiscal system by an income tax; war on the large companies. (Nothing more was heard of the election of judges nor of the suppression of standing armies, inscribed in Gambetta's program of 1869.) The Radicals added the giving up of colonial expeditions.

The two parties were agreed regarding divorce (which was made lawful in 1884), on the general-ticket system (established by law in 1885 *), and on the three-year military service with the abolition of drawing lots, of the one-year volunteer privilege and of exemptions for teachers and clergymen. The military law, however, was delayed by the Senate and was not carried until 1889.

The main point of dispute was Tonquin. Ferry declared war

* The *loi sur le scrutin de liste* of 1885 required each department to elect its deputies by general vote of the whole department. Seven departments had ten or more deputies; the Nord had twenty, the Seine thirty-eight. France has changed her system six times since 1848: 1848, general ticket; 1852, single-member districts; 1871, general ticket; 1875, single-member districts; 1885, general ticket; 1889, single-member districts.—Tr.

on the Radicals by saying: "Our danger is on the left." The Radicals profited by the panic caused by the exaggerated news of a defeat in Tonquin to induce the Chamber to vote against the Ferry ministry (May, 1885). This was the last ministry supported by a compact majority. Until 1889 there were no more coalition ministries.

The Left, during its rule, had abandoned the financial policy of the Conservative party: balanced budgets, gradual liquidation of the debt, and economy in expenditure. For the new railroads (the Freycinet scheme), school buildings, and colonial expeditions, it had incurred outlays which increased the debt and caused a yearly deficit. People were accustomed to see the budget estimates exceeded by the actual revenue; the commercial crisis which began in 1882, after the crash of the General Union, brought a contrary result. The bad state of the finances furnished an additional argument against the Opportunists.

In the electoral campaign of 1885 the government had against it two oppositions: the Radical Left, whose leader was Clémenceau, and the Conservative and Catholic Right which, without attacking the Republic, avowed itself in opposition to the constitution. Since the death of the Count of Chambord in 1883 the Legitimists had united with the Orleanist party, except a small group of irreconcilables, who transferred their homage to the Spanish branch of the Bourbons. From both sides the Opportunists were censured for the Tonquin war, the deficit, and the commercial crisis.

These were the conditions under which the general election of October, 1885, was held, the first by general ticket since 1871. Republican candidates were presented on two rival tickets, Republican and Radical, which divided the party votes and prevented their getting majorities. The Conservatives presented themselves as a single party. The general-ticket system was advantageous to the Conservatives, their voters being distributed in more compact groups. The government lost seats. At the regular elections more Conservatives than Republicans were successful. At the subsequent elections, in the cases where no candidate had received a majority at the first balloting, the alarmed Republicans restored party discipline, all voting for a combined ticket made up of those candidates that polled the largest vote at the first ballot. The Chamber was composed of 382 Republicans and 202 Conservatives (reduced to 180 by the quashing of elections). A new generation of Conservatives had just entered

political life with a negative program of Liberal opposition. The division was almost wholly local; the whole east and south had elected Republicans, the west and north Conservatives. The Republican party, divided into two nearly equal sets, Opportunist and Radical, had for practical purposes no majority. In order to rule, two lines of policy were attempted. The one consisted in combining the two sets of Republicans against the Right; this was the "policy of Republican concentration," formulated even before the elections by the Brisson ministry, which had followed Ferry. This policy was adopted by the first ministries after the elections (Freycinet, January, 1886; Goblet, December, 1886). The other policy consisted in getting the Conservatives to support the ministerial Republicans against the Radicals; this was the "policy of conciliation," so named because it implied an end of the war upon the Conservatives and the clergy. It was tried by the Rouvier ministry (May, 1887) and given up after the resignation of Grévy (December, 1887).

The concentration ministry demanded the expulsion of the "pretenders." The Chamber had refused this in 1883, but voted it in 1886. The object was to strike at the Count of Paris, who was accused of having posed as a sovereign at the marriage of his daughter.

The ministers, aiming to retain office, abandoned all schemes of positive reform. Their program was limited to settling up the colonial enterprises (the Tonquin appropriations had been carried by a majority of only a few votes) and to restoring the balance in the budget. The Chamber overturned the Goblet ministry for not having proposed sufficient reductions of expense (May, 1887).

The Boulanger Crisis (1887-89).—The Radicals had allied themselves, against Ferry, with the *patriots*, who disliked colonial expeditions because they diverted France from the war of revenge against Germany. They insisted on a cabinet position for General Boulanger (January, 1886), who, on becoming minister of war, made himself notorious by his democratic utterances. The Opportunists, on their return to power (May, 1886), dismissed Boulanger from his office; the Radicals supported him. His name became so celebrated that a personal party formed itself around him, the nucleus of it being the *Patriotic League* and a little group of Radical deputies.

Presently came the scandal of the decorations. Wilson, the President's son-in-law, was accused of selling places in the

Legion of Honour. Grévy defended his son-in-law. The Chamber censured the ministry and demanded the retirement of the President. Grévy attempted to obtain a Radical ministry, but nobody was willing to form a ministry with Boulanger, or dared to form one without him. Grévy, unable to find ministers, at length yielded to the necessity of resigning (December, 1887). The Opportunists, having (thanks to the Senate) a majority in the joint meeting of the Chambers, wished to elect Ferry to the Presidency; but the Municipal Council of Paris declared that it could not answer for public order if Ferry were elected. The Conservatives, remembering Article 7 against Ferry, cast their votes for General Saussier; Ferry failed of a majority on the first ballot; and on the second, Carnot, a moderate Republican who was acceptable to the Radicals, was duly elected.

Carnot's ministers (Tirard, December, 1887, defeated on the question of Revision, and Floquet, Radical, April, 1887) reverted to the policy of Republican concentration, but they had to contend with the new Boulanger party.

The Boulangists no longer fought the Opportunists alone; they had quarrelled with the Radicals also, and aimed to suppress the Parliamentary system itself, which they reproached with weakness and corruption. The party had no positive policy; its program was summarized in three words by Boulanger: Dissolution, Revision, Constituent Assembly (*Constituante*). That is to say, they would dissolve the existing chambers and elect an assembly which should establish a republican but non-parliamentary government, with a single Chamber and an executive independent of the legislature (substantially the Constitution of '48). Above all General Boulanger must be placed in power; the rest would come of itself. All patriotic Frenchmen were appealed to, including Conservatives and Catholics, to join in establishing "the open republic." The party took the name of *Revisionist* or *National*. It adopted a novel plan of campaign, based on the *scrutin de liste*: wherever a vacancy was to be filled in the representation of a department, it nominated General Boulanger for the seat and was thus obtaining a little plebiscite in his favour. The plan was begun in 1888 and was carried out systematically.

The Catholic Conservatives, opposed to Boulanger up to that time on account of his radical utterances, joined the Revisionists in order to destroy the constitution. They used Boulanger to make a breach in the Republic. The electoral campaign conducted by the Boulanger committee with money supplied by Con-

servatives (the Count of Paris and the Duchess d'Uzès) was promoted by advertising devices similar to those used in commerce: reams of posters, portraits, and biographies of General Boulanger, songs in his praise, crowds hired to shout "*Vive le général Boulanger!*"

In presence of this coalition, Republicans of all shades, including the Socialists, joined hands to oppose the threatened dictatorship. Boulanger was very badly received on his appearance in the Chamber, and, abandoning the parliamentary field, devoted himself to running elections. He had no success in the Republican strongholds of the east and south; but he was repeatedly elected, with large majorities, in the Conservative or doubtful departments of the north and midland. He was elected by 240,000 votes against 165,000 in Paris, where the Radicals supported him through dislike of the ministry (January, 1889). This success was his ruin.* His tactics depended on the general-ticket system, which made the vote of a whole department necessary to fill every casual vacancy in the Chamber, and thus made possible a kind of general plebiscite in his favour, since such vacancies were of quite frequent occurrence. Further, at the approaching general election, the system would make it possible for him to unite his Conservative and Radical supporters in each department by giving each set a share in his general ticket. Boulanger had the imprudence to display his hand in advance and thus forewarned his adversaries. The *scrutin de liste*, it is true, had been a sort of fad, held both by Opportunists and Radicals; but the Republicans made up their minds to sacrifice it, and, in spite of the Conservatives, who were now in favour of it, they passed a law, in February, 1889, restoring the system of single member districts (*scrutin uninominal*). They also took the further precaution of making it unlawful for any person to present himself as a candidate in more than one district.

The Radical party, weakened by the secession of the Boulangists and by the recollection of Boulanger's alliance with them, yielded place to the Opportunists who had always opposed him. The Floquet ministry, left in a minority on the question of revision, was followed by the Tirard-Constans ministry (February, 1889), which got rid of Boulanger by ordering him to

* I say nothing as to his chances of success by an appeal to force against the government at Paris, where the swarms of police seem to have been favourable to him. No arrangements for such a stroke had been made by him.

appear before the Senate, constituted as a high court for the trial of offences against the safety of the state. Boulanger retired to Belgium without making a defence, and at once ceased to be of political importance. Later in the year the great Exposition of 1889 produced a calm in politics.

At the general election of 1889 the contest was between the Republicans of all shades on the one hand and the coalition of the enemies of the Parliamentary Republic on the other. The Revisionists wanted a different sort of republic, and the Conservatives and clergy wanted no republic at all. The Parliamentary Republicans made a defensive and conservative campaign, defending the existing constitution against the Revisionists, and the laws as to schools and the military service against the Catholics.

The Republicans carried 366 seats, against 172 carried by the Conservatives and 38 by the Revisionists. The Conservatives came from the north and west; the Revisionists from the Seine and various scattered constituencies. The coalition of the enemies of the Parliamentary Republic fell to pieces. The Revisionists, beaten at the municipal elections of Paris (April, 1890), ended by disbanding themselves on the suicide of Boulanger.

Transformation of the Extreme Parties.—The Republican majority elected in 1889, on a negative platform, had little beyond a policy of stand-still: to keep up the school law and the military law, attacked by the Conservatives, and to give quiet to the country after its political excitements. In four years the Chamber passed only certain commercial laws and a tariff (1892) which restored the protective system. Napoleon in 1860 had inaugurated the system of commercial treaties aiming at a gradual introduction of free trade; the Chamber refused to renew these treaties as they expired, and returned to the plan of an independent tariff, with the right of lowering or raising the duties at will. The coalition of the great manufacturers with the agricultural group, who asked for protective duties on grains and cattle, secured the adoption of a complicated scale of duties, some of them so high as to seem prohibitory. The act established two tariffs: a *maximum* tariff to be levied on the products of countries having no reciprocity treaty with France, and a *minimum* tariff to be accorded by such treaties. In practice most countries have obtained the minimum tariff; and it has even been necessary to go below this minimum in the case of Switzerland, in order to preserve friendly commercial relations with her.

The strife between the two wings of the Republican party, stilled by the common danger of 1889, did not break out again with much energy. The official policy continued to be Republican concentration. The ministerial Republicans, known also as *Moderates*, had a majority of the Chamber, furnished the ministers, and held the power. The Radicals, reduced to a small minority, clung to the wrecks of their program (Constitutional Revision, Income Tax, and Separation of Church and State), without the least chance of carrying a single point.

But in the extreme parties a change was preparing. A small Socialist party of workingmen had arisen again since 1879, from the amnestied Communists; but it had remained a little doctrinal church without political activity, and had been divided, since 1882, into two hostile sects. The Marxist group, the least numerous, chiefly in the north, adhered to the German collectivist ideas, and had a centralized organization. The other group, the "French Federation of Social-Revolutionist Workingmen," declared its willingness to work for one thing at a time, in order to make its whole program possible. It had a federal organization, leaving each local branch to govern itself. It was nicknamed *Possible-ist* by its opponents. It broke into two factions (1890) on a constitutional question as to the powers of its central organs. The remnants of the Blanc Socialists formed another small party; so that there were four Socialist parties in the field. Their agitation was still confined to the workingmen of the large cities and the mining districts, and their activity was chiefly directed to the municipal elections of Paris. In the Chamber a small group, called the Workingmen's party, had dwindled to a few revolutionary deputies without a definite program. In 1893, in prospect of the general election, all the Socialist factions joined in a league for bringing in the "Social Republic." The league was joined by the discontented Radicals, who had formed the main body of the Revision party. In order to win over the peasants, the Socialist congress of 1892 had adopted a program of agrarian reforms; and the party no longer demanded the suppression of private property in land, so far as regards peasant farms.

At the same time the Conservative party was splitting up. The Count of Paris, against the view of the older Orleanists, had joined in the cry for Revision (1888), and was acting "parallel" with the Boulangists. Abandoning the ground of traditional royalty, he had declared that the monarchy must be re-established

by popular vote—the principle of the Imperialists. Henceforth all the monarchist parties were supporters of the revolutionary doctrine of popular sovereignty. This development displeased both the old Legitimists and the old Orleanists; but a new generation of Conservatives were displacing them.

The great Conservative party, discouraged by the reverse of 1889, gave up hope of restoring monarchy and reverted to the policy of constitutional opposition. It no longer attacked the form of government, taking care, however, not to recognise it openly. It simply opposed the ministers and their policy. Some of the party eventually adopted the plan of publicly accepting the Republic in order to conciliate Republican voters. The movement was hastened by the Pope, who urged Catholics to accept the Republic definitively, and try to control it in the interest of religion. This policy, officially avowed in 1892, was expressed in a phrase attributed to Leo XIII., in a private interview, “to accept the constitution in order to modify legislation” (referring especially to changes of the school and military laws). Thus, by dismemberment of the Conservative party, the Catholic party of the *Ralliés* was formed.

This evolution gave new life to the policy of conciliation between the Conservative Right and the Republican Centre. In 1893, before the general election, the ministerial Republicans (Moderates) disclosed a willingness to coalesce with the *Ralliés* and declared themselves unalterably opposed to the Socialists by closing the Labour Exchange of Paris. The reconciliation in the Assembly was an easy matter: the Right, resigning themselves to the school and military laws, demanded only a conservative policy in social matters; but among the voters the case was different, for the Republican voters bore a grudge against the old Conservative leaders who had tried to overturn the Republic in 1889.

The Conservatives, in preparing for the electoral campaign of 1893, started the Panama scandal, which, greatly exaggerated by the press, opened an era of denunciations, violent controversies, and trials for libel. The leaders of both wings of the Republican party, Moderate and Radical, were, as a result, badly compromised, being suspected of having themselves taken part in the financial “deals” of the Panama Company, or of having neglected to prosecute those guilty of them. The old leaders were pushed aside and replaced by a new set.

New Division of Parties.—The new Chamber elected in 1893

disclosed these transformations. One half of the deputies were new men. The tactics of the Right had failed; only 30 *Ralliés* and 60 other Conservatives had been elected. The Republican majority continued to be divided into Moderates and Radicals—the latter counting from 120 to 155 members. On the extreme Left the Socialist Union, having drawn together the disorganized voters of the old Revision party, had carried 55 seats. For the first time there was a parliamentary body of Socialists sufficiently large to influence politics. On the whole the centre of gravity had shifted toward the Left.

The Conservatives being now practically out of the field, the Republicans had again to choose between *concentration* of Moderates and Radicals against the two extremes (Conservatives and Socialists) and a homogeneous ministry made up wholly of Moderates or wholly of Radicals. Concentration would give an enormous majority, but it would impose a passive policy, for the Moderates had exhausted their own program of reforms and favoured no part of the Radical program. A homogeneous ministry was advocated by the theorizers among the Moderates, as harmonizing with Parliamentary government; but the Moderates alone could hope to supply such a ministry, and it was doubtful if they could give it a majority without help from some part of the Right—which would have spoiled the homogeneity, and would have been a return to conciliation, a difficult thing after the electoral campaign of 1893.

According to official utterances, the policy of all ministries from 1889 to 1893 was one of concentration; that is to say, a majority of each were Moderates, following a policy of conservation accompanied by democratic declarations. Since those years normal political life has been disturbed by the crimes of the Anarchists. These were too few in number to form a regular party, and refrained on principle from parliamentary action, refusing to formulate a positive program. Their aim, they said, was to free the individual by destroying society. But by adopting the methods of the Russian terrorists, especially in the use of explosives, they gave themselves a prominence wholly out of proportion to their importance. "Propagandism by facts," already tried in 1892, assumed political significance when the Anarchists attacked the organs of the State, first the Chamber and later the President. The public powers defended themselves by two special laws, the one after the explosion in the Chamber, December, 1893, and the other after the assassination of Carnot,

June, 1894; Anarchist journals were suppressed, their propaganda and their crimes were stopped. But during this crisis concentration had fared badly; the Radicals had opposed the ministers in the passage of the exceptional laws, accusing them of confounding the Socialists with the Anarchists. At the election of Carnot's successor, each wing of the Republicans presented a candidate of its own. Casimir Perier, the Moderate candidate, was elected by a large majority over the Radical Brisson; he received nearly all the votes of the senators.

A personal quarrel broke out between the Socialists and the new President. Casimir Perier, by his name and fortune, seemed to symbolize the domination of the *bourgeoisie*. In the Chamber the Moderates and the Radicals began to oppose each other squarely. About a hundred deputies, undecided between the two, were ready to support any ministry, but anxious to avoid displeasing their constituents by an unpopular vote. This wavering group placed three Moderate ministries in minority (Casimir Perier, April, 1894; Dupuy, January, 1895; Ribot, October, 1895) on certain railroad questions. At the fall of the second, Casimir Perier resigned the Presidency. He was followed by Félix Faure, elected by a coalition of the Moderates and the Right; but the vote for Brisson was larger than at the previous election; and the candidate who represented the opposition to the Radicals, Waldeck-Rousseau, was dropped. The third ministry, Ribot's, reverted to Republican concentration, carried an amnesty law in order to soothe the Socialists, and even presented a measure founded on the Radical doctrine of progressive taxation (progressive tax on inheritances). The wavering members were joining the Radicals; Brisson was elected President of the Chamber.

The third Moderate ministry was succeeded by a cabinet having for the first time a Radical chief, Léon Bourgeois. The new premier wished to form a concentration cabinet, but with a reform policy; but finding no Moderates willing to join him, he was under the necessity of making it purely Radical. Of the old Radical program he kept only a single point,—the progressive income tax,—coupling with it a series of economic "reforms" of the democratic sort. He promised also to bring light to bear on the financial affairs as to which recent Moderate ministries were suspected of irregularities.

On this program, a new disposition of the extremes came about. The Right joined the Moderates in resisting the income

tax, thus forming a party of social conservatism resting on the *bourgeoisie*, the clergy, and the office-holders. The Socialists joined the political Radicals, forming a party of Social Reform, and appealing to the masses. The old local division was still observable, in that the Conservatives drew their chief strength from the west and the Social Reformers from the south.

By winning over the crowd of wavering members, the Radicals gained a majority in the Chamber for their progressive income tax (1896). The Senate, by attacking the ministry, raised a conflict between the two houses which revived the agitation for revision.

By rejecting certain appropriation bills, the Senate compelled a resignation of the Bourgeois ministry and the formation of a homogeneous ministry of Moderates (Mélina, April, 1896) which, by the help of the Right, obtained a majority. But no party has a safe majority in the Assembly. By a phenomenon new in France, the policy of each party is dictated by its central, or less extreme, wing. The Right has abandoned its agitation for the repeal of the laws unfavourable to the clergy, and demands only resistance to further disturbance of existing society. The Socialists, at the other extreme, have dropped their revolutionary schemes, consenting to co-operate with the political Radicals in carrying a partial reform of society and in procuring a revision of the constitution by lawful means. For the first time since 1814 there are in France only *political* parties: no party avows a policy of subverting the Republic.

Political Evolution of France in the Nineteenth Century.—At first glance the political history of France during the past century seems an incoherent series of revolutions; hence the general opinion of other countries that the French are capricious in politics, and do not know what they want. Precisely the same was said of the English at the end of the seventeenth century.*

There is, however, a point of view from which these unaccountable revolutions present the appearance of an entirely intelligible development. The French nation at the end of the eighteenth century was still monarchical, but already democratic and free from clerical authority, at least in the east and south, where the people are most democratic, peasant proprietors are most numerous, and great landowners least influential. From this mass of

* A nation whose "fickleness" is notorious; they change their ideas frequently, said Torcey.

democratic monarchists a small revolutionary party branched off in 1792, in the contest with the King and court, becoming Republican almost against its will, but resolved to acquire the reins of power, by force if need be. From 1792 to 1870 this Republican party seized the government four times, in each case by the same process, a sudden stroke at Paris; but, being only a minority, it did not succeed in establishing itself firmly. The monarchical majority presently found means of restoring monarchy. Thus every Republican revolution was followed by a royalist restoration which lasted until a new generation gave the Republican leaders enough recruits to make a new revolution. But each revolution did away with some feature of the former system which could not be restored. Four times has this oscillation taken place.

First. The revolutionary party gained control at Paris by the 10th of August, 1792; and kept it until imperialism was set up by Bonaparte, who ousted the Republican rulers, without, however, re-establishing the traditional monarchy. The restoration of 1814, brought about by an accident of foreign policy, was but a partial one: it retained the social democratic organization created by the Revolution and the centralized administrative organization left by Napoleon. Upon this democratic society and this bureaucratic administration, it superimposed a political mechanism royalist in form, imported from England. The revolution of the Hundred Days was only an abortive attempt, the last episode in Napoleon's contest with Europe, the first of the military revolutions that followed the general pacification of 1814. It had, however, an influence on the political development by uniting the remnants of the revolutionary Republicans with the discontented Imperialists.

Second. The revolution of 1830 was made by a small Republican party belonging to the new generation but brought up in the faith of 1793. Too weak to impose its will on France, it yielded the power to the Liberal Royalists, who set up the July monarchy. It sought to recover control by armed outbreaks in Paris, 1831-34; but the government, resting on the majority, resisted, and broke up these attempts by force of arms, prosecutions, and legislation. But the July monarchy remained a revolutionary government, based on the sovereignty of the people and compromised by the tricolour flag, the symbol of the Revolution.

Third. In the next generation the Republican party, reduced

to a few secret societies, got the help of the Socialist workingmen and made the revolution of 1848. This time it set up the "Democratic and Social Republic." But it was unable to keep the power; the great majority of the nation was against it. The Republican Assembly of 1848 expelled it from the government; and when it tried to return by violence, destroyed it by military force on the "Days of June." Reconstituted as a democratic party, it was assisted by the monarchist Assembly of 1849; and at the moment when it had begun to gain the democratic regions of the south and east, it was rudely shattered by the Imperialist *coup d'état* of 1851. Napoleon III. established a government, monarchical in its processes, but even more revolutionary in principle than the July monarchy. From the revolution of 1848 he borrowed not only the power of the people to make the Constitution, but also universal suffrage, the starting-point of a new democratic *régime*.

Fourth. The Republican party, reconstituted after the amnesty of 1859, gathered strength in the new generation, and before the end of the Empire formed in the large cities and democratic regions a radical party sufficiently numerous to begin operations in the electoral field. It made the revolution of 1870, which, like that of 1792, was an outcome of foreign policy.

But the old royalist parties, in the confusion of the war, gained an accidental majority in the sovereign Assembly which came into power in 1871. The Republican party was rent in twain. The Socialist party of Paris tried to obtain control by the old Republican method of a revolution in Paris; it set up the Commune and was exterminated. France had received a political education and no longer accepted revolutions in Paris as decisive. The Republicans of the provinces supported the lawful government, and as early as 1871 had a majority of the voters.

Once more a Republican revolution was followed by a monarchical reaction, which failed, however, to bring about another restoration. Its failure was due to the revolutionary emblem, the tricolour flag, now become so completely the emblem of the nation that one of the royalist parties (the Orleanist) could not make up its mind to sacrifice it. The Republicans, by a compromise with these dissident monarchists, at length obtained the adoption of a republican constitution—parliamentary, like the Orleanist monarchy; democratic, like French society.

Little by little the royalist generation was passing away and its place was taken by Republicans. Since 1869 the latter were

in majority in the cities; in 1876 they became definitely masters of the east and south, which assured them a majority in the Assembly and control of the government. It had no further motive for making revolutions; it had only to maintain the existing system in order to win over gradually the west and north. Revolutions ceased when the Republican party, the only one organized for making them, had no further need of revolutions.

The political development of the nineteenth century has been a series of ebbs and flows, but the tendency has been toward republicanism. By repeated seizures of the government and an agitation more and more effective, the democratic Republicans have finally conquered France.

But the revolutions have been directed only to the structure of the central government and the possession of power. The social organization and the administrative mechanism have been preserved without serious change.

The democratic social organization, free from clerical control, established by the Revolution, was acceptable to the Republicans, and sufficiently popular to escape attack. The monarchical governments have tried indirectly to revive the influence of the great landowners, the middle class, and the clergy, but they have not touched any of the social institutions—peasant proprietorship, equal division of inheritances, civil equality, eligibility for public office without distinctions of birth, exclusion of clerical control: France has steadily preserved the social system of the Revolution.

The centralized and bureaucratic administrative system of the Empire has also remained nearly intact. All the parties, when in opposition, have declared it to be oppressive, but, on attaining office, have preserved it as an instrument of power. Of the older Imperial *régime* France still retains:

(a) The central administration with its ministers, the departmental administration with its prefects and sub-prefects, and its control over the communes;

(b) The judicial organization with its body of court counsellors and its permanent judges, with its Ministry of Justice composed of advocates and prosecuting attorneys, with its antiquated and formal civil procedure and its secret inquisitorial criminal procedure, with the Napoleonic *code* almost unchanged (the granting of divorce is only a return to an institution taken away in 1815); with its sale of the posts of solicitor, notary, registrar, and bailiff;

(c) The administrative justice of the Councils of Prefecture

and the Council of State, briskly attacked by the Liberals under Napoleon III., but later accepted, including the famous Article 75 of the Constitution of the year VIII. ;*

(d) The ecclesiastical organization established by the Concordat and organic laws; the Legion of Honour, with its titles copied from noble orders;

(e) The University, with its rectors, inspectors; its *lycées*, with their military discipline; its Normal School, and its system of competitive examinations;

(f) The revenue system, with its direct and indirect taxes, its monopolies and *octrois*, and its agents divided off into special services. New taxes have been created, old ones have been increased, loans have been contracted, the national revenue has been greatly enlarged, but neither the assessment nor the mode of collection has been changed.

The *customs system* instituted to protect the manufacturers of fabrics and iron wares by duties all but prohibitory, was shaken by Napoleon III. and opposed by the agricultural regions of the south and the traders of the seaports, and has been almost made over since 1871.

Only four changes of importance have been made in the Imperial system in a century:

1. The *municipal authorities* have been made elective—a beginning of local political life of decentralization. Following the old aristocratical principle, these offices are without salary, but they are sought as stepping-stones to national services where salaries are paid.

2. The *military system* has been transformed, in imitation of

* This article, which forbade suits against administrative officers without permission of the government, was abrogated by decree of the Government of National Defence in September, 1870. The author must have had in mind the unexpected result of the abrogation. The ordinary courts held that it opened the way for suits against public officers for illegal action toward private citizens; in other words, that it introduced in France the familiar doctrine of our common law that an official who acts without legal warrant may be proceeded against as a private trespasser. But this view was not sustained by the *tribunal des conflits*—the final court of appeal. That court decided in 1873 that, under the separation of powers, the judiciary cannot interfere with the action of the executive and its agents. The result of abrogating Article 75 was, therefore, to cut off even the limited right that previously existed of bringing suit against official wrongdoers by permission of the government. (See Ducrocq, "Droit Administratif," 6th ed., vol. i., p. 644.)—Tr.

Prussia, by the introduction of universal military service for a short term, and the abolition of the national guard—retaining, however, the old military schools.

3. *Public education* has been modified by the creation, since 1850, of secondary schools for boys, managed by ecclesiastics, in competition with the state schools; by the reform of higher education on the model of the German universities; by the institution of gratuitous and compulsory primary education, free from clerical control, and a system of schools for girls—both copied from Germany. These changes have created a body of lay teachers in competition with the teaching brotherhoods and sisterhoods of the previous system.

4. The condition of labourers has been modified by freedom of combination and by the creation of syndicates modelled on the English trade unions.

With the exception of making the mayors and local councils elective,—which was only an application of the new democratic policy,—the evolution has been mainly the introduction of foreign institutions into France.

France, then, is *governed* by men chosen on the democratic principle of election; its political chiefs are the deputies, chosen directly, and the senators and ministers, chosen indirectly, by the voters—all under the control of the press and public opinion. It is *administered* by a bureaucratic body of officials, divided into special services, which are organized as a hierarchy, with chiefs who co-opt and control each other, subject to regulations and special usages, but independent of public opinion.

These two sets of public servants, drawing their authority from two opposing principles, tend to apply two conflicting conceptions of government. The politicians, having only a temporary power delegated from below, incline primarily to please *the voters* on whom they depend, by conforming to the prevailing opinion. The officials, exercising a power conferred from above and practically for life, tend to see in the citizens *subjects of administration*, who must be kept in due submission to authority and regulations.

Monarchical governments prevent conflicts between these two sets by giving preponderance to the officials; the democratic system makes the conflict perpetual. The elected representatives of the people, wielding the sovereignty, are not content with exercising an indirect control over the officials through budget votes and the enactment of laws. They wish to share with the official

class the practical sovereignty, which is the executive power. The Chamber has established its superiority over the administrative officers through the persons of the ministers, its indirect agents, who, in becoming official heads of the services, have inherited the absolute authority over the official class formerly exercised by the royal and imperial ministers. And as the ministers, once installed at the top of the hierarchy and surrounded by permanent officials, readily catch the spirit of their subordinates and the traditions of authority, the Chamber keeps them in dependence upon itself by means of the Budget Committee and interpellations.

It is this that makes the Interpellation the leading institution of French parliamentary procedure. The deputies, the sole direct representatives of the citizens, are led, by a logical consequence of the democratic principle, to assume the part of directors and defenders of the people; individually they come into personal contact with the ministers and officials, to hasten the slow action of the latter in the settlement of business matters affecting their constituents, to check or repress abuses of power, and to nominate candidates for vacant offices, or even to insure their own personal influence or that of their particular group. This is what is called "the pressure of the deputies on the administration." The frequency of interpellations and the pressure of the deputies are condemned by all writers on constitutional law as interferences of the legislature with the executive, contrary to the doctrine of the separation of powers. They have none the less become fundamental features of the political life of France. They are practical contrivances which enable two contradictory sets of institutions to exist side by side: a democratic political system and a permanent administrative hierarchy. It compels the permanent officials to submit to the people's chosen representatives.*

BIBLIOGRAPHY.

For bibliography see chap. v. On the Commune, **A. Schulz**, "*Bibl. de la Guerre Franco-Allemande et de la Commune*," 1886. A bibl. may be

* An Interpellation is a formal question addressed to the ministers, calling on them for explanation and defence of their action on any matter. It may be introduced by any deputy, and is entitled, under the rules, to a place on the program of some sitting within a month of its introduction.—**TR.**

found by A. Adler in "Handwörterbuch der Staatswissenschaften," under the word "Commune," (1891).

SOURCES.—See bibl. of chap. v. The most important parliamentary documents are: 1. "Enquête sur les Actes du Gouvernement de la Défense Nationale," reports, testimony of witnesses, official despatches (see objections and corrections, *Annales de l'Assemblée*, vol. xxv.); 2. "Enquête sur l'Insurrection du 18 Mars," at Paris and in the country (see for claims, "Annales," vol. xi.).

ANNUAL: **Daniel** (pseud. d'A. Lebon), "L'Année Politique," since 1874.

In addition to the publications in chap. vi.: The *Français* (royalist liberal, important for the Assembly period), for the period 1871-78; the *République Française*, Gambetta's organ, the *Soleil*, the *Gaulois*, the *Figaro*, and the *XIXe. Siècle*.

In addition to the reviews: *Revue Politique et Littéraire*, called the *Revue Bleue*, the *Revue Socialiste*. (For the history of the socialist parties in France there is a very abundant collection in the *Musée Social* founded by the Comte de Chambrun).

The recollections, memoirs, and letters are of small importance.—**J. Simon**, "Souvenirs du 4 Septembre, 1874"; "Le Gouvernement de M. Thiers," 1879.—**Herisson**, "Journal d'un Officier d'Ordonnance," 1885.—**J. de Gastyne**, "Mémoires Secrets . . . de la Commune," 1871.—**H. Pessard**, "Mes Petits Papiers," 2 series, 1887-88.—**Jourde**, "Souvenirs d'un Membre de la Commune," 1877.—**Beslay**, "Mes Souvenirs," 1873.

A collection of placards of 1870-71: **J. Claretie**, "Les Murailles Politiques de la France," 1870-71, 1880, in-4. "Documents pour . . . l'Hist. de la Commune," 1871, collection of the official acts of the Commune.

WORKS.—GENERAL WORKS: **Zevort**, "Hist. de la 3^{me} République," vol. i., 1896, stops at May 24, 1873.—**Oncken**, "Zeitalter des Kaisers Wilhelm," 2 vols., 1890-92, Oncken coll.

ON THE COMMUNE: there is no scientific history; the leading works are: **Maxime Du Camp**, "Les Convulsions de Paris," 5 vols., 1878-79, conservative.—**Arnould**, "Hist. de la Commune," 3 vols., 1878.—**Lissagaray**, "Hist. de la Commune," 1896 edit.; both communalist.

ON THE ATTEMPT AT RESTORATION IN 1873: **Chesnelong**, "La Campagne Monarchique d'Octobre, 1873," 1895.—**E. Daudet**, "Trois Mois d'Hist. Contemp.," 1873.

ON MAY 16: "Du 16 Mai au 2 Sept. 1877," 1877, published by H. Monod.

DESCRIPTION OF FRENCH INSTITUTIONS: **A. Lebon**, "Das Staatsrecht der Französischen Republik," 1880 (Marqu. coll.).—**Block**, "Dictionnaire de l'Admin. Franç.," 3d edit., 1891.—The collection in course of publication, "La Vie Nationale," a series of popular works, contains much information.—**A. L. Lowell**, "Parties and Governments in Continental Europe," 2 vols., 1897; chapters i and ii give an excellent sketch of the institutions and party divisions of the third Republic.—**Dupriez**, "Les Ministres dans les principaux pays," 2 vols., 2d ed., 1893; Part VIII. is an instructive essay on the "rôle of the ministers in France."

ON FINANCE: **Mathieu Bodet**, "Les Finances Françaises de 1870 à 1878," 2 vols., 1881.—**Amagat**, "Les Finances Françaises," 1889.—**L. Say**, "Dictionnaire des Finances."

CHAPTER VIII.

BELGIUM AND HOLLAND.

Formation of the Kingdom of the Netherlands.—The kingdom of the Netherlands was made up of territory that had been conquered by France and reduced to French departments, but was made independent again in 1814. It was made by uniting three pieces which had been separate before the French annexation: the former Austrian Netherlands, the Bishopric of Liège (Lüttich), and the old United Provinces (known as Holland).

For these countries the French occupation had been, not a mere episode, but a profound transformation. It had swept clean the ground on which the political edifice of the nineteenth century was to be built. There were in the Low Countries before the Revolution provinces of very unequal importance, governed under old and dissimilar customs, some of them without political rights (the Belgian districts conquered by the Dutch). Society was divided into classes unequal before the law; all political power was in the hands of certain families or privileged bodies; the central government was weak; religious liberty was not recognised. France had swept away all the privileges, all the customs, all the political bodies of the provinces. She had set up in their stead the French system—equality among the citizens, equality among the provinces, systematic division into departments, each provided with a complete system of public services. The old aristocratic and irregular system was gone; a new democratic society, with a centralized administration, had been created in its stead. This new society has made the Netherlands of the nineteenth century.

The French revolutionary *régime* has remained firmly rooted in the country; but French rule did not survive the fall of Napoleon. The inhabitants had little liking for it, as it came to them in the form of the military conscription and the Continental blockade—death and ruin. As soon as the French armies withdrew French administration collapsed. The movement began with the arrival of the allied army at The Hague. Some members of the old Dutch government organized a provisional admin-

istration, recalled the former sovereign, William, and called a meeting of notables to advise as to further proceedings. The head of the provisional government, Hogendorp, proposed to re-establish the old system; that is to say, the confederation of provinces possessing unequal rights. Professor Kemper, though an enemy of the French, showed that the old government was no longer possible, and induced the Assembly to break with the past, to accept the work of the Revolution, and establish a new unitary kingdom.* The prince took the title of William I., King of the Netherlands.

The Belgian provinces and the Bishopric of Liège, having no legitimate sovereigns, were treated as vacant territory. The Allies, being friendly to the Orange family, gave these lands to the kingdom of the Netherlands in order to strengthen it and "put it in a position to resist attack until the powers could come to its aid." The new kingdom was to serve as a barrier against France. The great powers, by an agreement inserted in the treaties of Vienna, declared it neutral, and engaged with each other to respect its neutrality. The neutrality of the Netherlands became and has remained a principle of European public law.

Belgian Opposition.—The union of the Dutch and Belgian Netherlands seemed to be a combination advantageous to all. Belgium could supply agricultural and factory products; Holland had its shipping and its colonies; the two countries complemented each other. At least one-half of the Belgians spoke Flemish, that is to say, Dutch.

The treaty of 1814 stipulated for equal protection of both forms of worship and representation for the Belgians in the States-General. It said "the Union shall be close and complete." But it was made under conditions that made it hateful to the Belgians.

The king had promised a constitution, and appointed a commission, sitting in Holland, to draw it up. The *Fundamental Law* established a constitutional monarchy of the sort desired by Louis XVIII. and the English Tories. The king shared the legislative power with the States-General, and exercised the executive power through ministers; he had the right of making peace and war. But the ministers were not made responsible to the States-General. These had only a very limited right of pro-

* The new kingdom re-established the old provinces, dividing the largest, however, Holland and Flanders.

posing legislation, and no right of amendment. Of the two Chambers composing them, the upper was appointed by the king; the other was elected by the provincial councils, which in turn were elected by the property owners, through the medium of electors. The system of administration established by the French was retained: each province had a governor and each commune a burgomaster, all appointed by the King. The French codes and hierarchy of judges were retained, but trial by jury was suppressed.* In principle, liberty of the person, of residence, and of the press was accepted, but the deposit and stamp were continued for newspapers, and the government could suspend all forms of liberty in times of disturbance.

This constitution displeased the Belgian Liberals, brought up in the school of Benjamin Constant. They said its provision for representation was illusory, being subject to the personal power of the King; and that its liberties were only a sham, being left at the mercy of the administration.

The constitution laid down the principle of liberty of worship and of the press, and thereby it offended the Belgian Catholics. The bishops of Belgium condemned it publicly in 1815, in their *Doctrinal Judgment*, which forbade their flocks to swear to support the constitution. "We have thought it necessary to declare that none of our spiritual subjects can, without making themselves guilty of a great crime, take the different oaths prescribed by the constitution." Among the provisions "opposed to the spirit and maxims of the Catholic religion, the Judgment cites liberty of religious opinion, equality of civil and political rights, the right of publicly exercising every form of worship, and liberty of the press. To swear to maintain freedom of religious opinion and equal protection for all forms of worship is to swear to maintain and protect error as truth, to favour the progress of anti-Catholic doctrines, to sow, as far as we can, in the field of the family the foulness and poison that shall infect present and future generations. . . The Catholic Church, which has always thrust from its bosom error and heresy, could not regard as its true children those who should dare to swear that which she has never ceased to condemn. This dangerous new doctrine was introduced, for the first time in a Catholic country, by the revolutionists of France, about twenty-five years ago, and then the head of the Church condemned it emphatically. To swear to keep a law

* It has not been re-established, up to the present time, in the kingdom of the Netherlands.

which makes all the King's subjects, whatever their religious belief, capable of filling all offices and dignities, would be to justify in advance the measures taken to confide the interests of our holy religion in Catholic provinces to Protestant officials." The bishops also called attention to the article "which authorizes liberty of the press and opens the door to an infinitude of disorders, a deluge of anti-Christian writings." The Archbishop of Malines, who wrote the Doctrinal Judgment, was brought before the courts and condemned to deportation. But the Belgian clergy refused absolution to the notables who had taken the oaths.

This constitution, viewed with disfavour by both Liberals and Catholics, had been established in a way that gave offence to all Belgians. The King convoked an assembly of about 1600 Belgian notables to approve it: the assembly pronounced against it by a strong majority—796 to 527. The government then declared that those who had rejected it for religious reasons (126 Belgian Catholics) ought to be disregarded; it then added to the number in favour those who had not voted. In this way it decided that the Fundamental Law had been adopted by Belgium.

The government made itself even more unpopular than the constitution among the Belgians. The seat of government was in Holland. Nearly all office-holders, high and low, were Dutch. In 1830 one of the seven ministers was Belgian; 11 of the 117 officials of the Interior were Belgian; 288 out of 1967 military officers were Belgian. In the States-General, Belgium, with three and one-half millions of inhabitants, had the same representation as Holland with two and one-half millions. By detaching a few Belgian members, the government could have a majority for Dutch measures. All the public establishments, the Bank, the military schools, were Dutch. The Dutch brought to the new kingdom a heavy debt which increased the fiscal burdens of the Belgians. They introduced their system of taxes—the grist tax and the meat tax—which were disliked by the people of Belgium. The Belgians felt that they were treated as an annexed people and exploited by the Dutch.

The government seemed to aim at assimilating the Belgians by compelling them to change their language. From 1819 on knowledge of Dutch was required of every person entering the public service. In 1822 Dutch was made the official language, except in the Walloon districts, for all public and judicial acts. Now, the language of the bar, even in the Flemish districts, was French. By this measure the government alienated the lawyers.

It made itself odious to newspaper men by prosecuting them before exceptional tribunals. It succeeded in irritating the clergy by establishing in 1825 the Philosophical College of Louvain and requiring future ecclesiastics to spend two years in study there. The kingdom of the Netherlands was hardly accomplishing what the treaty of 1814 promised—an "intimate and perfect union."

Revolution of 1830.—The Belgians were discontented, but had no practicable means of escape from Dutch rule. The King was against them, and the King was the government. In the States-General the Dutch had one-half of the votes and, thanks to the Orangists of Antwerp and Ghent, always had a majority. The Belgians were not even united among themselves; some were Catholic partisans of the old *régime*, others were Liberals and devoted to the principles of the French Revolution. In 1827 it seemed as if the Catholics, appeased by the Concordat arranged between the King and the Pope, were going to come over to the side of the government.

But some of the political leaders of the Catholic party had lately adopted a new doctrine mainly inspired by the reading of Lamennais. Instead of crying down the liberty condemned by the Doctrinal Judgment of the bishops in 1815, they were insisting on it as favourable to the triumph of Catholic truth. The Liberal Catholics were, perhaps, not very numerous, but they took the lead of the party, and concerted action in common with the Liberals.

In 1828 the two Belgian parties, Catholic and Liberal, formed the *Union* to oppose the common enemy, the Dutch government. They began with petitions to the King demanding the liberties guaranteed by the constitution. Then they demanded a separate administration for Belgium. The conflict led to a rising.

It was the July revolution in France that gave the Belgians the idea of a revolt. At the anniversary of the king's accession, August 25, 1830, the opera *La Muette* (the Mute) was played at Brussels. Its appeals to Liberty excited the spectators; they cried, "Let us do as the French have done." The mob demolished the police offices and the place where the ministerial organ was published. It was still only a Brussels outbreak; but the citizens raised the Brabancon flag, and the province of Brabant was in revolt. Prince Frederick, eldest son of the King, went to Brussels with troops and put himself in communication with the leading men. It was agreed to ask the King to convoke the

States-General to consider the question of giving each country a separate government under the same King (a personal union). The States-General met and the King spoke against the separation. At Brussels, on the 23d of September, Prince Frederick's army of 10,000 men seized the upper part of the city and attacked the lower part. But the troops found it barricaded and defended by citizens in arms. After three days of fighting the army was driven off. The insurgents had formed an executive committee to take charge of the insurrection; the committee organized itself as a provisional government and issued a proclamation calling home the Belgians in the King's army: "Belgian blood has been shed. . . This shedding of generous blood has broken every tie. The people of Belgium are unshackled." On the 29th of September the States-General pronounced for separation, by 50 votes against 44; but it was too late.

All the Belgian provinces rose in revolt. The Dutch held only two fortified places, Maestricht and Antwerp. The provisional government decreed, October 4, "The provinces of Belgium, detached from Holland by force, shall constitute an independent state." It promised to draw up a draft of a constitution, and to convoke a national congress to establish a system of government for all Belgium. King William tried to arrest the rupture. He sent his son to Antwerp to promise a Belgian administration, managed by Belgians. The Prince even declared: "Belgians, I recognise you as an independent nation; choose freely deputies to a national congress." The provisional government replied: "The people have driven the Dutch from Belgian soil; they alone, and not the Prince of Orange, are at the head of this movement to gain independence and establish their nationality."

Founding of the Kingdom of Belgium.—The Congress called to make a constitution for Belgium was elected by men twenty-five years of age and paying a tax varying from 13 to 150 florins, according to locality, or following a liberal profession (in all 44,000 voters).

There were four parties: the Orange Monarchists (Ghent and Antwerp); the Republicans, whose leader, Potter, had conducted the rising; the partisans of annexation to France (in the Liège region); and finally, the partisans of a national monarchy, far the most numerous of the four.

The Congress voted, at the outset, four principles: 1st, The people of Belgium are independent. 2d, The people of Belgium adopt as the form of their government an hereditary monarchy

with representative institutions (174 votes against 13 Republicans). "It was not worth while," said Potter, "to spill so much blood for such a trifle." 3d, The members of the Orange family are permanently excluded from power in Belgium (168 votes against 28 Orangists). 4th, This Congress is empowered to make a constitution for the kingdom.

It was necessary to settle at once three practical questions: 1st, To choose a sovereign; 2d, To draw up a constitution; 3d, To announce the new kingdom to Europe.

First. For the choice of King, the Congress at first hesitated between the Prince of Leuchtenberg, son of Beauharnais, the Austrian Archduke Charles, and the Duke de Nemours, son of Louis Philippe. On the second ballot, in February, 1831, it elected the Duke de Nemours; the vote stood Nemours 97, Leuchtenberg 74, Archduke Charles 21. Louis Philippe refused his approval of his son's election. The Congress then elected a Regent, Baron Surlet de Chokier, who assumed the government until a King should be elected. Presently the French and English governments agreed to propose Leopold of Coburg, who was elected by 152 votes against 44.

Second. During the long negotiations respecting the choice of a King, the Congress adopted the constitution. This was in two parts; one providing for the organization of the government, the other laying down principles of constitutional law.

The government was organized on the parliamentary system, as represented by the principles of the English Whigs. The sovereignty belongs to the people, not to the King. "All the powers emanate from the nation. The King has no powers other than those formally assigned to him by the constitution and laws made in accordance with it." As a confession of his subordination to the people, the King must make the following oath before taking possession of the crown: "I swear to observe the constitution and laws of the Belgian people, to maintain the national independence and the integrity of the territory." The King has the executive power, but he can exercise it only through ministers. The ministers are appointed by him, but they are *responsible* to the Chambers, and in practice this responsibility is interpreted as political rather than legal. The constitution promised a law regulating the responsibility of ministers and the procedure for enforcing it; but no such law was passed till 1870, and the one then passed was practically needless. The ministers resign when they have no longer a majority in the

Chamber; this makes the Chamber the ruling power, and no statute could add to the effectiveness of its control. The legislature is composed of two houses—the Senate and the Chamber of Deputies. Both are elected by the same voters and have the same legal powers; but the Senators must be men of property, paying at least two thousand florins in taxes. Every tax and every levy of troops must be voted, in the first instance, by the House of Representatives. Every statute must be accepted by both houses and the King, and all three have the right of proposing changes of law. Senators and Representatives are paid for their services. To be a voter it was necessary to pay taxes to the amount of at least 20 florins (\$8.00)—a requirement which appeared very small at that epoch.

The constitution decreed that there should be communal and provincial councils to administer local affairs. These were to be elected by the taxpayers—the qualifying amount being smaller than in the case of national voters. They were to have about the same powers as the municipal and general councils have had in France since 1871. In those days of centralization their powers were thought extensive.

The principles of public law established by the Congress rest on the doctrine of complete liberty, accepted equally by the leaders of both the Catholic and the Liberal parties. The constitution guaranteed all the liberties: liberty of the person, of residence, of the press, of meeting and association, of worship, of education, of language. A Catholic protested against the restriction "saving the responsibility for writings that violate the rights of society." "Under this clause," said he, "Abbé Lamennais could not have given the human race his letters of liberation, his chapters on liberty, which were against rights claimed by society."

When the position of the Church was to be settled some of the liberals proposed to place it under government control. The Catholic liberals protested; Nothomb said: "We have come to one of those epochs which occur only once in the life of a nation; let us take advantage of it. We have a chance to exercise a glorious initiative and to consecrate unreservedly one of the greatest principles of modern civilization. For centuries there have been two contending powers, civil power and ecclesiastical power. They fought for the control of society as if the empire of the one excluded that of the other. It is this conflict that we are called on to stop. There are two worlds before us, the civil

world and the religious world, they coexist without blending, they have no point of union. Civil law and religious law are distinct, each has its domain. . . . There is no more connection between the state and religion than between the state and geometry. . . . Let us signalize our transition by a grand principle; let us proclaim the separation of the two powers." This separation was established in Belgium according to an original system. The Church was separated from the state in so far as the lay portion of society have no power over the clergy; the Belgian bishops are directly installed by the Pope and appoint the parish priests without interference on the part of the government. But the Church retained the privileges which the state recognised before the separation, the right held by all religious bodies of receiving an appropriation from the state, exemption from military service for clergymen, the right to military honours in ceremonies, the possession of cemeteries, and the right of overseeing religious instruction in the schools. The separation freed the Church of its burdens and left it its privileges.

Third. The recognition of the Kingdom of Belgium was a long and delicate operation. It depended at once on King William and the five great powers who had taken the Kingdom of the Netherlands under their guarantee. The King was unwilling to give up Belgium and prepared to reconquer it. Belgium, having no regular army, would have been unable to defend itself alone, even against the army of Holland; it was at the mercy of the great powers. Their disunion was its salvation; the three absolutist eastern powers wished to support William in maintaining the treaties of 1815 and in crushing the revolution. The two liberal powers of the west sympathized with the Belgians—the French to destroy the unpopular treaty of 1815 and to show their power, the English to keep the mouth of the Scheldt from falling into the power of France. The two western powers had better opportunity for action and were more free to act. They secured the decision that each of the five powers should send an agent to a conference in London to settle the Belgian question.

The London Conference settled the fate of Belgium, and the Belgian Congress could only submit. It had to settle three important questions: the independence of Belgium, the frontier between Belgium and the Netherlands, and the division of the debt between the two governments, besides a number of smaller questions: navigation of the Scheldt, demolition of the fortresses constructed against France, and indemnity to the Germanic Con-

federation for Luxemburg. It was not long in declaring for independence: but on the other questions its decisions were guided by diplomatic motives. It adopted successively three sets of decisions (January 20, 1831, June 26, October 15). The last, the 24 Articles, was the least advantageous for Belgium, obliging her to give up part of Luxemburg and Limburg. The Belgian Congress accepted the decision with great lamentation, and the powers recognised the kingdom by declaring it neutral (February, 1832).

King William refused to accept the decision. At the expiration of the armistice of November, 1830, which the powers had imposed on him, he had begun the war again (August, 1831) and routed the two Belgian armies; Leopold had called France to his assistance, and it was a French army that delivered Belgium. But the Dutch army, in retreating, had retained Antwerp. It was again a French army which in 1832 besieged and took Antwerp; it worked without a declaration of war, as an army of execution charged with carrying out the decisions of the conference.

After the fall of Antwerp, the Dutch retained only two forts on the Scheldt, and the King stubbornly refused to give them up. Belgium, on her part, kept the bits of Limburg and Luxemburg which the London Conference had granted to Holland. When in 1839 William finally decided to demand an exchange, the Belgian Chamber at first tried to resist, but in the face of the threatening powers it yielded with many protests.

Thus the independence of Belgium was proclaimed in principle by the Belgian insurgents and established in fact by France, with the official consent of the great states of Europe.

THE KINGDOM OF THE NETHERLANDS SINCE 1830.

The Constitution of 1848.—The Kingdom of the Netherlands, reduced to the former United Provinces, had at first only a sleepy political life. The personal government of the King continued until 1848. Politics were confined to the Belgian conflict and the financial difficulties. The war and the King's personal expenses had increased the debt by 375,000,000 florins in 10 years. The press remained subject to the system of repression organized against the Belgian papers.

William I., who had become very unpopular, abdicated in 1840: he wished to marry a Catholic, a maid of honour to the late

Queen. His son William II. dismissed his father's ministry, but preserved the same system. The malcontents formed a small liberal party in the second Chamber. Their leader, Thorbecke, professor of public law at Leyden, took the initiative in demanding a revision of the constitution in 1844. The King at first refused. But in 1847 the agitation became more active, and in 1848 the King, doubtless affected by the revolutions of Europe, appointed in addition to his ministry a commission charged with the preparation of a plan of revision; Thorbecke and three other liberals were members of it. Then the King convoked the States-General, with a double number of deputies, to act on the revision. They adopted the new fundamental law, and it was promulgated in November, 1848.

The revision of 1848 was chiefly concerned with the method of recruiting the States-General and with their rights. The first Chamber, instead of being appointed by the King, is elected by the provincial estates; the second Chamber is chosen by direct election of persons who pay a direct tax, varying according to locality from 160 to 20 florins. The deputies receive a salary. The second Chamber is elected for four years renewed by halves biennially: but the King can dissolve the whole at any time. The powers of the second Chamber are much increased; it has the right to propose laws and to amend bills proposed by the government. The ministers are declared responsible before the States-General.

The fundamental law of 1848 recognised the rights of provinces and communes. Each of the eleven provinces* has its provincial estates, elected by the same voters as the second Chamber, for 9 years, renewed by thirds triennially; the members receive a salary. They are occupied chiefly with roads and canals. Each commune has its council elected for 6 years, renewed by thirds (the property qualification for communal electors is one-half of that for political electors), its aldermen elected by the communal council, and its burgomaster appointed by the government. The police is their chief province. The decisions of all authorities are submitted to the government, which may annul them.

The constitution also acknowledges the right of communities to levy taxes and make regulations for the maintenance of dikes and waterlocks (*Waterschappen*).

* To the 7 former United Provinces have been added 3 formerly subject countries, Drenthe, Brabant, Limburg; and Holland had been divided into two parts.

The Parties since 1848.—With the constitution of 1848 begins the political life of the Netherlands. The responsibility of ministers before the Chambers is not interpreted as strictly as in Belgium. The King retains in practice a portion of his personal power. He has even been known to take a ministry from the minority when the majority was feeble and divided. But before a clear majority he has always yielded. Custom has inclined more and more toward the parliamentary system.

In the Netherlands parties are chiefly religious, formed on the question of public schools. The Constitution of '48 established the principle that the state should provide free primary education; it recognised for all creeds the liberty of establishing private schools, but the public schools must remain neutral.

The Catholics compose at least a third of the whole population of the Netherlands and almost the whole population of the southern provinces (Brabant and Limburg). Accustomed to follow the direction of their clergy, they have constituted a compact political party. The Protestants have divided into two parties, the *Orthodox*, who favour Calvinistic education, and the *Liberals*, who favour non-sectarian education. The orthodox have been the nucleus of the Conservative party, which calls itself *anti-revolutionary*; but they have been re-enforced by the partisans of the *régime* existing prior to 1848, that is to say, of the government of officials, King, and aristocracy. The upper Chamber is controlled by manufacturers and capitalists; the second Chamber is composed of men who represent the average opinion of small traders and small landowners. The labouring classes are excluded from the right of voting.

Since 1840 the Liberal party, which is the party of the cities in Holland, has had an almost uninterrupted majority, and has usually held the ministry; but at different times it has been so weakened by divisions that the King has been enabled to follow his personal preference by taking Conservative ministers.

The Catholic party began by working with the Liberals, who favoured religious liberty, which the Orthodox party was threatening. In 1853, when the Pope created the official organization of the Church in the Netherlands (an archbishop at Utrecht and four bishops, one for Holland, two for Brabant, and one for Limburg), the Orthodox party protested. The Liberal ministry declared it impossible to hinder the Catholics from organizing, and confined itself to proposing a law which gave the government the right to supervise the parishes. When it was finally decided to

organize the primary instruction promised by the Constitution of 1848, the Catholics voted with the Liberals to establish the law of 1857, obliging every commune to maintain non-sectarian public schools. The public school was not to give any denominational instruction; its aim was to be simply to "develop the intellectual faculties of the children and educate them in all the virtues, both Christian and social." The master must "not do or permit anything contrary to the respect which is due to the religious feelings of persons of another faith." The commune pays the expenses of the public school and appoints the masters; it has the right to levy a school tax; education is neither gratuitous nor compulsory. The government makes good a part of the expense and appoints the inspectors.

The Orthodox Protestants and Catholics, who object to neutral education, have established private schools of their own creeds (statistics of 1890 show about 3000 public schools with 450,000 scholars, against 1300 private schools with 195,000 scholars). The Catholic party has re-enforced its organization in the Catholic districts; the communal councils have employed their right of choosing teachers and to supervise education in such ways as to transform the public schools into Catholic schools. The clause of the law forbidding any teaching offensive to any religious body has been in some cases interpreted in such manner as to cut out from the list of studies the history of the Reformation and the wars against Spain.

The Catholic party, now become stronger, joined the Orthodox party against the Liberals to repeal the law of 1857 and establish denominational public schools. The attempt began in 1868. A Conservative ministry re-established separate government departments for Catholics and Protestants. The bishops issued a manifesto against the school law, adjuring parents to leave their children without instruction rather than send them to the non-sectarian school. This attack has been several times renewed. The Liberals retorted with the law of 1878 which maintained the principle of non-sectarianism in the same form as in 1857, increased the salaries of teachers, and made the government responsible for 30 per cent. of the expenses.

The Liberal party, united to support the non-sectarian schools, divided on other questions: colonial policy, military reform, and extension of the right of voting.

First. The system imposed on the natives of the Dutch Indies, especially in Java, produced benefits for the mother country;

since 1850 the government had been in the habit of balancing the budget by means of the colonial surplus, and it had paid off a portion of the old debt. In 1873 began the war against the hostile people of Atjé, in Sumatra, which is still going on, and involves heavy military expenditures. From that date the colonial budget has yielded, not a surplus, but a deficit which, added to the deficit of the home government, amounts on an average to from 4,000,000 to 6,000,000 florins. It has been found impossible to agree on the creation of new taxes to restore the equilibrium, and so loans have been resorted to (1886, 1891). The policy of the colonial war, and the deficit which it involved, have become a favourite ground for the attacks of the opposition.

Second. The army was recruited by enlistment, to which was added in 1861 enrollment by drafting with right of substitution; the national guard, the *Schutterij*, has been preserved in the cities. After 1870, under the influence of the general reform movement in the armies of Europe and the fear of a German invasion, a party was formed to demand the abolition of drafting and substitution, and the establishment of universal military service as in Prussia, with a reserve in place of the national guard. But the movement met with stout resistance from the clergy and the well-to-do classes, which controlled the States-General, and the ministerial plan of 1891 was rejected in 1893. The Chamber voted the principle of personal service, but the Catholics defeated the passage of the law and caused the fall of the Conservative ministry which had proposed it.

Third. Extension of suffrage was demanded as early as 1872 by a portion of the Liberals. But it could not be accomplished except by a revision of the constitution. The government waited years before presenting the plan; the States-General were slow in discussing it; the revision, proposed in 1880, was not voted until 1887. It extended the right of voting to all those who could fulfil the educational and property qualifications. This designedly vague formula has allowed the increase of the number of voters from 135,000 to 350,000. The lower House, numbering 100 members, is renewable in full every fourth year, instead of being renewed by halves every second year, as before.

A small socialist party has been formed under a very active leader, a former pastor, Domela-Nieuwenhuis; it was recruited in the large cities, and in Frisia, among the country labourers, and demanded universal suffrage and the abolition of the upper Chamber. There have been two riots in Amsterdam.

The Liberals have divided on the suffrage question; the majority has supported the Tak ministry, which proposed to extend the right of voting to all who could read and write. The dissenters, joining the Conservatives and Catholics after the dissolution in 1893, secured a majority in coalition which took the ministry in 1894. This ministry succeeded in 1896 in passing an electoral law which grants suffrage to most taxpayers. The total number of voters is estimated at over 600,000.

The nineteenth century has been a time of prosperity for the Netherlands. The population has increased from 2,600,000 in 1829 to 4,600,000 in 1891.

Luxemburg.—The powers of Europe, when creating the Kingdom of the Netherlands, had given Luxemburg a special and complex position. While all the other Belgian provinces had been ceded to the King of the Netherlands "as an increase of territory," Luxemburg had been given to him as *indemnity* for the German domains of the Orange-Nassau family, which had been annexed to Prussia. It was set up as the Grand Duchy of Luxemburg, hereditary in the Orange-Nassau family in the order of male succession, and made a part of the Germanic Confederation. The city of Luxemburg was made a federal fortress, with a Prussian garrison, and the King of the Netherlands granted to Prussia the right of appointing the military governor. The Grand Duchy became a state of the Germanic Confederation, attached to the Netherlands by a personal union alone.

But the King of the Netherlands, sovereign of Luxemburg, created it as a province of his kingdom, applying to it the Constitution of 1815 and the Dutch laws. Provincial estates were organized after an aristocratic system in three orders: knights, citizens, and members for the rural districts. These were elected indirectly by propertied voters, and chose the deputies to the States-General. They had, beyond this, little more than a consultative function. The country was in fact governed by Dutch officials.

The Revolution of 1830 cut Luxemburg in two. The city, which was occupied by the Prussian garrison, alone remained subject to the King. All the rest of the country revolted, joined Belgium, and was incorporated in the new kingdom. Only one part remained Belgian definitively.* Another part, the smallest,

* In exchange for the bit of Luxemburg which was taken from the Germanic Confederation, Limburg was made a duchy and entered the Confederation.

was restored to the King of the Netherlands in 1839 and reunited to the city; this is the existing Grand Duchy of Luxemburg. Belgian rule had introduced there habits of self-government and liberty which made it difficult in practice to return to the former government, so the King gave Luxemburg a separate administration. In 1842 he carried it into the German Zollverein, or customs union, against the wish of its inhabitants.

In 1848 the King granted the Grand Duchy a special constitution modelled on that of Belgium, with a responsible government and a Chamber directly elected by the propertied voters (10-franc qualification). As a part of the Germanic Confederation, Luxemburg sent deputies to the Frankfort Parliament.

During the general reaction against revolution, the King abrogated the Constitution of 1848 as contrary to the principles adopted by the other sovereigns of the confederation. He gave it instead the Constitution of 1856, which raised the voting qualification and robbed the Chamber of almost all its powers, leaving it only the right to vote the laws and *new* taxes proposed by the government.

After the dissolution of the Germanic Confederation, the King wished to sell Luxemburg to France, but was prevented by Germany. Prussia withdrew her garrison, and the position of Luxemburg was arranged by an international convention of the powers in 1867. It was declared a sovereign, neutral state, under the guarantee of the powers; but it was forbidden to have an army or a fortification. The King granted the Constitution of 1868, founded on the same liberal principles as that of 1848, but rendering the government practically independent of the vote of the Chamber. Between Luxemburg and the Netherlands there remained only a personal union.

In 1890 William III. being dead, his daughter inherited the Kingdom of the Netherlands. But the Grand Duchy of Luxemburg, hereditary only through the male line, passed to his nearest agnate, the Duke of Nassau, who had been deprived of his Duchy of Nassau by Prussia in 1866.

The leading political question, in this little state, is that of languages: French is still the official language, but the majority of the inhabitants speak German and have their commercial relations with Germany, and the reigning family is German.

THE KINGDOM OF BELGIUM.

Formation of Parties.—In 1830 all the Belgians had been united against foreign rule. But the parties, which had joined for

the struggle, separated very soon. As early as 1831 a group of Liberals established a newspaper, the *Independence*, with the motto: independent civil power. It protested against the religious liberty adopted by the Congress: "The Catholic religion seems to us by nature given to encroaching; we believe it dangerous and continually hostile to civil society. . . We deem it our duty to watch its progress and resist its invasions." The government had two universities, Ghent in the Flemish provinces, Liège in the Walloon provinces; the two parties, taking advantage of the freedom of higher education, established each a free university, the Catholics at Louvain, the Liberals at Brussels.

In the first years of the kingdom the great divergence between Catholics and Liberals did not take a distinctly political form; parties were formed on practical questions. Until peace was declared with Holland, there were two parties—the *Greens*, who favoured war, and the *Ripes*, who favoured peace. The war party wished to keep Luxemburg in defiance of the powers. The Chambers were busy with the organization of local administration and the settlement of the finances. Belgium found herself at once burdened with a part of Holland's debt and impoverished by the rupture of relations with Holland. She went through a terrible crisis: in 1839 the Bank and the Savings Bank failed.

The government sought to keep itself free from party control. The ministries succeeded each other rapidly. But the King systematically avoided a party ministry. He chose men of moderate opinions, or even combined representatives of opposite tendencies (the Nothomb ministry—3 Catholics and 3 Liberals). It was at this time that the English theory of the eighteenth century was admitted, that the sovereign should keep the government from falling into the hands of a single party, and that the ministry must be, not homogeneous, but impartial, without a policy. . . The Minister of Justice in 1840 protested against the "fatal divisions of opinion that always entail opposing parties." He condemned "the division into Catholics and Liberals as one without meaning in the presence of the great principles of liberty consecrated by our constitution."

These peaceful intentions ceased when the Catholics, in the name of religious liberty, carried the Education Act of 1842. The prime minister, Nothomb, a Catholic Liberal, summed it up as follows: "No primary schools without moral and religious instruction. We break with the philosophical doctrines of the

eighteenth century, which pretended to secularize education and to constitute society on purely rationalistic bases." Religious education was declared compulsory in public schools and intrusted to the Church, the government reserving to itself only the right of supervision. This division was regarded by the deputies as a satisfactory settlement and the bill was passed unanimously, with the exception of 3 votes.

The Liberals, dissatisfied with the new law, sought to organize themselves to resist the clergy. Their leader was Defacqz, the Grand Master of the Belgian Free Masons. In 1841 he had founded, with the Liberals of every shade from the Orangists to the Democrats, a political society, the *Alliance*, having for its program the extension of the suffrage and a series of fiscal and judicial reforms. After the passage of the law of 1842 the Liberals formed local societies all over Belgium, and in 1846 the *Alliance* convoked a congress of the Liberal societies at the City Hall in Brussels. Three hundred and twenty delegates were present. The congress, under the presidency of Defacqz, decided to establish permanent Liberal associations in the cantons and adopted a platform for the Liberal party. Of the reforms which were demanded, two in particular marked the tendencies of the party: 1. "Extension of the suffrage by the continuous lowering of the property qualification down to the minimum set by the constitution"; 2. "The organization of public schools of all grades under the *exclusive* direction of the civil authorities, by giving them the constitutional means to compete with the private establishments, and taking away from the clergy the legal right to interfere with the instruction provided by the state." The suffrage and the schools have been from that time to the present day the two great political questions in Belgium.

• The King, being unable to make terms with the Liberals, had just formed, in March, 1846, a ministry composed of Catholics. This ministry tried, in 1847, to carry a law on secondary schools. The Liberals excited demonstrations against it in the large cities. Louis Philippe advised his son-in-law, Leopold, to "paralyze, strike down, annihilate that audacious society [the liberal Alliance] and by all means to maintain his ministry." Leopold preferred to yield to public opinion as shown in the cities; he took a ministry made up altogether of Liberals (August, 1847).

Struggles between Catholics and Liberals.—Since 1847 it has been the constant practice in Belgium to choose a homogeneous

ministry from the party in majority in the Chamber. Voters and members have grouped themselves in two parties, Catholics and Liberals, permanently opposed to each other. They struggle against each other in elections of all sorts: for the Senate, for the Chamber, for the provincial councils, and for the communal councils. They contend for possession of the ministry and in voting laws on every question which concerns the authority of the Church: education, public charities, cemeteries, civil marriage, or diplomatic relations with the Pope. The Catholics contend in the name of "the liberty of the Church," the Liberals in the name of the "independence of the civil power." The Catholics control all the Flemish provinces inhabited by peasants, Flanders, Antwerp, Limburg, and a part of Brabant. The Liberals' strength lies in the manufacturing Walloon provinces, Brussels, Hainaut, and the Liège district. Antwerp and Ghent, the two commercial cities of the Flemish provinces, and Namur and Luxembourg, in the agricultural region of the Walloons, are politically doubtful. Victory in these doubtful regions usually insures success.

Since 1847 the two parties have been alternately in power. Three times the Liberals have had control: August, 1847, to March, 1855; November, 1857, to July, 1870; June, 1878, to June, 1884—twenty-eight years in all. Their leader has been Frère Orban, member from Liège. The Catholics have been in power: March, 1855, to November, 1857; July, 1870, to June, 1878; and since 1884—twenty-three years up to 1896. Their leader was Malou, who died in 1886. This see-saw system has the appearance of parliamentary government, but the position of the parties is totally different. The English Whigs and Tories, separated by secondary differences, agree in upholding the constitution, which makes courteous relations possible. In Belgium Catholics and Liberals disagree even in their conception of society; the contest is not between two political parties, but between two societies brought up side by side in opposing principles. The contest lets loose hot religious passions and bitter hatreds both in Parliament and in the press. It breaks out in street demonstrations, which sometimes lead to fisticuffs. It has been feared that the constitution could not hold out against these agitations, and that liberty would be suppressed by the victorious party. In reality, thanks to the common sense and natural tolerance of the Belgians, the struggle has been kept within the limits of the constitution and liberty. It has not kept the

country from increasing its wealth and population in unprecedented proportions.*

The Catholic party has had no need to create a special organization for itself; its leaders are the bishops, its staff the parish clergy, its program the decisions of the Church. As the Liberal-Catholics of 1830 have died out the party has discarded the liberal doctrine set forth in the constitution, which had been condemned by Pope Gregory XVI. in 1832,† and by Pius IX. in the encyclical of 1864. The Liberal party had never been anything more than a coalition of the opponents of the Catholic party. Their sole ground of union was hostility to the clergy. When it was a question of ousting the Catholics from power, the Liberals organized themselves strongly, but after the victory the party was weakened by dissensions on other questions. It had the advantage of rousing the inhabitants of the great cities, the working classes, and the Walloons, who were more active and more turbulent than the Flemish peasants.

The Liberals have been long in power. From 1847 to 1870 they were in power 20 years. The Liberal ministry which was in office in 1848 kept Belgium out of the revolutionary movement except for an insignificant affray. A law passed in 1848 lowered the tax-paying qualification to the minimum set by the constitution, 20 florins, and declared all office-holders ineligible. Later the Liberal party regulated the secondary schools by the law of 1850; it refused to recognise the right of the clergy to supervise these schools. But the bishops, to secure this right for themselves, resorted to the arrangement known as the *Antwerp Convention*; as religious instruction can be given only by the clergy and with the permission of the bishop, it was agreed, when a city asks for a chaplain for its high school, to ask in return that it shall promise to subject its schools to Church supervision, and exclude from its high school ministers of other beliefs.

The Liberal party weakened itself by levying new taxes and lost its majority. The Catholic party gained the ministry in 1855. In 1857 it wished to carry a law to establish "the liberty of charity," which is the right of establishing charitable institutions to be administered by the clergy, or, as the bill said, admin-

	1831	1846	1890
* Population,	3,785,000	4,337,000	6,069,000
Foreign commerce,	400,000,000 fr.	—	6,000,000,000 fr.

† "That absurd and erroneous doctrine that liberty of conscience must be guaranteed to all."

istered by "persons designated from time to time to fill certain ecclesiastical or civil offices." The Liberals were aroused, insulted the Catholics, and broke out in riots. The King at first declared that he would support the ministry of the majority. But, the communal elections having turned in favour of the Liberals, the King formed a Liberal ministry, which dissolved the Chamber and secured a strong majority, 70 against 38.

The Liberals kept the power 13 years, during which time they accomplished several practical reforms: suppression of the *octroi*, 1860; revision of the penal and commercial codes, freedom of association, reduction of railroad rates. But in this period they divided, principally on the suffrage question. The *Young Liberals*, later called the *Progressists*, demanded extended suffrage, the Radicals even demanded universal suffrage,* while the old members of the party, the *Doctrinaires*, wished to maintain the property qualification. The Liberal Alliance broke up; the *Doctrinaires* founded the *Liberal Union* in support of the ministry. There was disagreement about the army also; the *Doctrinaires* wished to retain the system of enrollment, draft, and substitution; an *Anti-military League* was formed at Brussels in 1868 to replace the army with a militia. In addition to these general causes of contention, there were local oppositions: the Flemings demanded equality of Flemish with French in public acts; the Antwerp Liberals protested against the new fortifications, which, as they said, were making Antwerp a prison. In the elections of 1870 the Liberal malcontents, Anti-militarists, and Flemish Liberals refused to vote; a number of Radicals, it was said, went so far as to vote with the Catholics.

The Catholic party, assisted to power by the Democrats, settled a number of the questions which divided the Liberals. Flemish became the official language in the Flemish provinces; correspondence with the communes and with individuals, as well as criminal procedure, must be in the language of the district.

* These new ideas of the younger generations in Belgium have been attributed to the influence of French Republicans who took refuge there after the *coup d'état*. To their influence has also been attributed the Belgian literary revival which has resulted in remarkable productiveness for so small a nation. Brussels has during the last half of the century lost its provincial character and become one of the intellectual centres of Europe. But it is hard to tell whether this movement is due to foreign influence, or to the exceptional ability of the Walloons and the Flemings of the cities.

The voting qualification was reduced to 20 francs for elections to provincial councils, 10 francs in the case of communal councils.

This was the time of the struggle between the Pope and the Kingdom of Italy, between the clergy and the government in Germany. The Belgian Catholics favoured the re-establishment of the Pope's temporal power. They signed petitions demanding that a religious marriage should precede civil marriage, and organized processions and pilgrimages. The Belgian bishops denounced the governments of Italy and Germany. In 1876, at the great Catholic banquet at Mechlin, under the direction of the Archbishop-primate of Belgium, the Pope's health was drunk before that of the King. The Catholic ministry, composed partly of former Catholic Liberals, kept out of these demonstrations, and even declared its determination to uphold the constitution; in 1877 it carried a vote of censure against an address sent by the pontifical Zouaves of Belgium to the nuncio.

To contend against the Catholic agitation, the *Doctrinaires* and Progressists united and reorganized the Liberal party. In 1875 all the Liberal societies agreed to form the *Liberal Federation*, and hold regular meetings. The Flemish Liberals founded a review, the *Liberal Flanders*, revived the name of *Beggars*, which had formerly been borne by the Belgians who revolted against Spain, and adopted the *Gueuzenlied* or Beggars' Song.

The Liberal Federation complained that the clergy forced electors to vote for their candidates by watching their vote. It demanded an investigation into the means of assuring rural voters secrecy of the ballot (1876). The Catholic ministry decided, in 1877, to propose a ballot law. By this new system, copied from the English ballot, the voter receives a printed ticket, and goes alone into the electoral booth, where he marks the name of his candidate with a cross.

In 1878 the Liberals regained their majority in the Chamber (70 against 60), and with it the ministry.

The School Law.—The Liberal party remained in power six years, in which time they succeeded in establishing primary schools independent of the Church. At first they created a special ministry for public schools. Then they carried the law on primary schools. Every commune is obliged to maintain a public school, which shall be free to poor children at least. The commune appoints the teachers, but they must show a certificate of proficiency; the State appoints the inspectors and approves the

school-books. "Religious instruction is relegated to the care of families and the clergy of the various creeds. A place in the school may be put at their disposal where the children may receive religious instruction" (Article 4). Thus religious instruction ceased to be compulsory, but the schools remained open for the clergy to come and instruct the children. This arrangement was not enough for the Catholics; they demanded that religious instruction should be part of compulsory primary education.

The bishops met at Mechlin and officially condemned the school laws, agreeing to take ecclesiastical measures against the masters and scholars of lay schools. The children should be provisionally admitted to communion as having acted without discernment; but absolution should be refused to the pupils and teachers of normal schools, primary teachers, and parents who let their children attend "schools in which the loss of the soul cannot be prevented." The parish priests were to try and establish Catholic schools.

All over Belgium began an agitation to establish private Catholic schools and prevent the children going to the public schools. The clergy gained their point, especially in Flanders. According to the calculations of the Catholic party there were in November, 1879, only 240,000 pupils in the state schools and 370,000 in the private schools, and in 1881 in the private schools 63 per cent. of the whole school population (81 per cent. in West Flanders, 84 per cent. in East Flanders).

The Belgian government has no direct influence over the clergy, for the bishops are appointed by the Pope and control the priests of their dioceses. The ministry therefore addressed itself to the Holy See. The nuncio replied at first that the Pope had urged moderation upon the bishops and that in protesting against the law the bishops had acted on their own responsibility. But when the ministry tried to represent the Pope's attitude as a reprimand of the Belgian clergy, it received a flat contradiction. It then publicly accused the Holy See of "trickery," recalled the Belgian ambassador from the papal court, and dismissed the nuncio (1880). The rupture between the government and clergy became a public issue. The Chamber accordingly voted an investigation of the schools, and published the reports of the committee, describing the sort of pressure brought to bear on teachers and parents by the clergy, and showing the insufficiency of the education given by the parish schools. In 1883 the Chamber suppressed the salaries of 400 vicars

or chaplains who performed no real service as vicars but acted as teachers in the Catholic schools. It abolished the privilege of theological students in military matters. The Liberals even began to consider means of hindering the increase of convents and monasteries, which had doubled in number and membership from 1846 to 1880.

But the Liberals were suffering from a new dissension within the party. The *Progressists* in 1881 demanded that the right of voting in national elections should be granted to the provincial electors (see p. 250). This the *Doctrinaires*, who controlled the ministry, refused. A National League was formed to promote an extension of the suffrage. The Radicals in the Chamber demanded a revision of the constitution in order to establish universal suffrage; this was rejected by 113 votes against 11. The ministry granted only an extension of the provincial suffrage to those who could pass an educational test.

The government had also caused dissatisfaction by its financial policy. To strengthen the public schools it had increased the grant for primary education year by year up to 22,000,000. The result was a growing deficit: 6,000,000 in 1881, 12,000,000 in 1882, 25,000,000 in 1883. The government had met this by means of a loan, and in 1883 proposed additional taxes on alcohol and tobacco and a raising of the customs tariff.

The discontent was so general that at the partial renewal of 1884 only 3 Liberal deputies were elected against 66 Catholics. The Catholic party, strongly organized to oppose the school law, suddenly gained a majority of 32 votes in the Chamber. The Catholic ministry, at once installed, busied itself with restoring sectarian primary education. The law of 1884 authorized communes to maintain, in place of a neutral public school, a private Catholic school. The signature of 20 fathers of families was necessary to oblige the commune to keep up the public school. The commune got the right to include in its curriculum religious and moral instruction, placing it at the beginning or the end of the session in order that parents who objected to it might be able to keep their children away from it. Public teachers whose schools were closed were dismissed with an allowance of 750 francs. Under this law, in all the districts which were under clerical control, especially in Flanders, the public schools were suppressed and replaced by Catholic schools whose teachers, whether laymen or members of religious orders, are not required to pass examinations for license.

Establishment of Universal Suffrage.—Since 1884 the Catholic party has steadily held the majority * and the ministry. But side by side with the old Liberal opposition has arisen a democratic opposition which is very active in the manufacturing districts of Liège and Hainaut, and the cities of Brussels and Ghent. It is conducted by parties of different views, united only to secure universal suffrage—a socialist party connected with the German socialists, composed chiefly of Flemish workingmen, having for centres the *Voorhuis* of Ghent and the Brussels *House of the People*; secondly, a revolutionary Republican party composed chiefly of Walloons, in communication with the French Republicans, recruited among the miners and workers in metals; thirdly, a Radical party, hostile to the rule of the property holders and to the military draft.

In 1886, during the economic crisis, the revolutionists organized strikes and demonstrations at Liège and in the coal districts, which resulted in an insurrection: mills were burned, the army was sent against the strikers, and a hundred or more were killed. The committee charged with investigating the condition of the industrial classes pointed out as legitimate their demand for compulsory personal military service. The King desired it also as a means of strengthening the army, but the Catholics, who had defeated it once already in 1872, continued to oppose it. Contemporary with the campaign for universal suffrage was the Democrats' campaign for the abolition of the privilege given to drafted men of finding substitutes.

The old Liberal parties first attempted to reconstitute the union; but the negotiations fell through (1887); the *Liberal Association*, the Progressists, demanded that suffrage should be extended to all who could read and write; the *Liberal League*, the *Doctrinaires*, refused. The opponents of the Catholics remained therefore broken up into three sections, divided on the suffrage question. The old Liberals, under Frère Orban, wished to keep the property qualification; the Progressists, under Janson, adopted, at the Brussels Congress of 1887, suffrage for all who could write; while the Democrats demanded universal suffrage.

Political life in Belgium has since then centred less in the sessions of the Chamber, where the Catholic majority is assured, than in the demonstrations and meetings of the Democratic parties. The Progressists have joined in the support of the Radical

* In 1886 it had even increased it, 98 against 40; between 1888 and 1892, however, the Liberals regained 24 seats.

platform, abolition of substitutes in the army (1889), and later universal suffrage. People resigned themselves to the fact that the constitution of 1831, the most liberal of its time, did not answer the conditions of political life 60 years later. The King himself in 1890 expressed the wish that the government should take the initiative in proposing a revision of the constitution.

The Catholic party, in order to put an end to the trouble, decided in 1891 to accept revision in principle. In a population of 6,000,000 souls there were not as many as 135,000 national voters; it was therefore generally recognised that the requirements for voting must be changed. But it took two years to agree on the precise changes to be made.

The Catholics proposed a lodger qualification, as in England and Holland; the *Doctrinaires* an educational qualification; the Progressists would have nothing less than universal suffrage. After a year of discussion and negotiation the Senate and Chamber agreed to vote the revision (1892), and both houses were dissolved. The Catholic party won a majority once more (92 against 66), but not the two-thirds majority necessary for a change in the constitution. The Chamber rejected all the propositions (February, 1893). The workingmen, irritated by the long delays, threatened a general strike if universal suffrage were not voted, and trouble began again in Brussels. The militia was called out, but did not seem inclined to march against the workmen.

The Chambers were alarmed and determined to pass the Nysens project, a combination of the systems of the different parties (1893). The new electoral law established *plural voting*. It gives to every man over 25 years of age at least one vote, with the right to additional votes on fulfilment of any of the following conditions: 1st, head of a family; 2d, possessor of real estate or a savings-bank deposit to the extent of 2000 francs; 3d, graduate of a high school. No one can have more than 3 votes. (For the Senate 75 senators are elected by voters over 30 years of age, 26 by the provincial councils.) Voting has been made compulsory, under penalty of a fine and disfranchisement for the fourth abstention. The government had proposed proportional representation, the Catholics rejected it.

The new system created 1,350,000 voters, with 2,066,000 votes. At the first election, in 1894, the old Liberal party disappeared almost entirely, except a few Progressists. The Catholics had an enormous majority. The Walloon provinces elected principally

Socialists. The Catholic party used its large majority to carry in 1895 a law on municipal elections, favourable to the peasants, and a school law intrusting religious instruction in the schools to priests. It also gave a share of the public-school moneys to the Catholic parish schools.

The balance of parties in Belgium has been destroyed by universal suffrage. The *Doctrinaire* party no longer exists; its voters, for fear of socialism, have joined the Catholic party. The whole field is now occupied by the two extreme parties: the Catholic party, supported by the Flemish peasantry, and the Socialist party, strong among the industrial classes of the Walloon provinces. Between the two, the Progressists, who have grown more and more like the French Radicals, are obliged, in order to oppose the Catholic government, to join the Socialists. It is the struggle of anti-clerical Republicans against the partisans of Church and Monarchy.

BIBLIOGRAPHY.

THE NETHERLANDS AND LUXEMBURG.

BIBLIOGRAPHY.—See **Langlois**, "Manuel de Bibl. Hist.," paragr. 66 and 133.

WORKS.—The chief modern histories of the Kingdom of the Netherlands are : **Nuyens**, "Geschiedenis van het Nederlandschen Volk van 1815," 4 vols., 1883-86.—**F. de Bosch-Kemper**, "Geschied. van Nederland na 1830," 5 vols., 1873-82 ; both conservative.

ON THE FOUNDATION OF THE KINGDOM : **Th. Juste**, "Le Soulèvement de la Hollande et la Fondation des Pays-Bas," 1870.

ON POLITICAL INSTITUTIONS : **De Hartog**, "Das Staatsrecht d. K. Niederlande," 1886 (Marquardsen coll.) a juridical account, with bibl.

ON RELIGIOUS PARTIES : **Chantepie de la Saussaye**, "La Crise Religieuse en Hollande," 1860.—**Fr. Nippold**, "Römisch Kathol. Kirche im K. d. Niederlande," 1877.

FOR LUXEMBURG : **Eyschen**, "Das Staatsrecht d. Gr. H. Luxemburg," 1890 (Marqu. coll.), gives a bibl., a history, and a description of institutions.

BELGIUM.

BIBLIOGRAPHY.—See **Langlois**, "Man. de Bibl. Hist."—**Pirenne**, "Bibl. de l'Hist. de Belgique," 1893, stops at 1830.—**Lorenz**, "Catal. de la Librairie Française," gives a number of Belgian works.

SOURCES.—The sources may be classified as follows :

PARLIAMENTARY DOCUMENTS : **Huyttens**, "Discuss. du Congrès Nation. de Belgique," 5 vols., 1845. Then, since the origin of the Chambers, the "Annales Parlementaires de Belg." Among the accompanying documents, "Enquête Scolaire," 5 vols., 1881-84.

RECOLLECTIONS AND PRIVATE PAPERS.—Among the recollections published by politicians or on their papers : **L. de Potter**, "Souvenirs," 2 vols., 1839, repub.—**P. de Decker**, "15 years, 1830-45," 1845, liberal.—**Discaillies**, "Ch. Rogier," 4 vols., 1895, liberal.—**Nothomb**, "Essai sur la Révol. Belge," 2 vols., 4th edit., 1876, Cath. liberal.—**Van de Weyer**, "Mémoires," 2 vols., 1871.

PAPERS AND REVIEWS.—The most important reviews publications are : *L'Indépendance Belge*, liber. ; *Le Bien Public*, Cath. Liberal reviews : *Revue de Belgique* ; *Flandre Libérale*.

WORKS.—LARGE GENERAL HISTORIES : For the period 1814-30 : **De Gerlache**, "Hist. du Roy. des Pays-Bas," 3d edit., 3 vols., 1859, Cathol., a hist. of the whole kingdom up to the separation.—**Hymans**, "Hist. Parlement. de la Belg. from 1814 to 1830," 1869.—For Belgium since 1835 : **J.-J. Thonissen**, "La Belg. sous le Règne de Léopold I.," 4 vols., 1855-58, conservative.—**Hymans**, "Hist. Parl. de Belg. de 1830 à 1880," 1877-80. This history of Belg. has the most complete supply of documents, consisting of an analysis of all the debates in the Chambers.

ON THE REVOLUTION PERIOD : The works of **Th. Juste**, "La Révol. Belge," 1870.—"Fondateurs de la Monarchie Belge," 22 vols., 1866-78, biographies of the politicians of 1830.—"Congrès National de Belgique," 2 vols., 1880. "Les Frontières de la Belgique," 1866.

ON RELIGIOUS STRUGGLES : **De Laveleye**, "Le Parti Clérical en Belgique," 1874. "La Belgique et le Vatican," 3 vols., 1880-81, attributed to **Frère-Orban**; both liberal.—**Woeste**, "Vingt Ans de Polémique," 3 vols., 1885, Cath.

ON POLITICAL INSTITUTIONS : **Thonissen**, "Constitution Belge," 3d. edit., 1879.—**A. Giron**, "Droit Public de la Belgique," 1884. "Droit Adminis. de la Belg.," 2 vols., 1881.—**Vauthier**, "Staatsrecht d. K. Belgien," 1892 (Marquardsen).—**Hymans**, "La Belg. Contemp.," 1880, a good historical outline of political evolution.—**Dupriez**, "Les Ministres dans les pays," 2 vols., 2d ed., 1893; vol. 1 has an excellent account of the Belgian Government. The author is himself a Belgian.

ON SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT : "50 Ans de Liberte," 4 vols., 1881. Collection of a number of authors on the progress of Belgium from 1830 to 1880 : Polit. Life (Goblet d'Alviella), Sciences, Arts, Letters, Education, Political Economy.

CHAPTER IX.

SWITZERLAND.

It would be a mistake to measure the interest of Switzerland's history by the size of her territory. This little country fills a large place in the history of the existing institutions of Europe. Every canton has been the scene of political experiences, and as each combined, in a way peculiar to itself, varying conditions of language, religion, territorial extent, and economic life, these experiences have been extremely varied. It is not possible to describe here the agitations, revolutions, wars, discussions, and constitutional changes of all the cantons; but to one who would comprehend the development of modern democratic states, this history is to be commended as embodying the most instructive practical examples of the principle of popular sovereignty.

The Switzerland of 1814.—Contemporary Switzerland, like Belgium and Holland, is a product of the French Revolution. France destroyed the old aristocratic *régime* in Switzerland and prepared the way for the new democratic system.

In the eighteenth century Switzerland was only a perpetual league of little sovereign states, held together by solemn engagements not to make war on each other, and to help each other against outside enemies. The union was not even a single league, but a series of leagues within leagues, made at different times and under different conditions. The old members of the confederation (13 cantons) were still distinguished from the simple allies, to say nothing of the districts ruled by certain cantons which had formerly conquered them.*

The cantons recognised no superior authority in the federation;

* The original league was between the three forest cantons, Uri, Schwytz, and Unterwalden; to these were added, in the fourteenth century, three cities, Lucerne, Zurich, Berne, and two small districts, Zug and Glarus. At the end of the fifteenth and the beginning of the sixteenth century Soleure, Bâle, Freiburg, Schaffhausen, and Appenzell joined the federation. These were the 13 confederate cantons. The *allies* were Geneva, Bienne, Neuchâtel, Saint-Gall, the league of the Grisons and that of the Valais. The subject districts were Vaud, Aargau, Thurgau, and the Italian district of Ticino.

the Diet was only a meeting of their ambassadors. They governed themselves without any common system, each following its own customs based on historical rights. In each canton, absolute power belonged to the people of one city or one region, commonly even to certain old families, who governed all the other inhabitants with despotic power. Each government, having power to regulate ecclesiastical affairs, imposed its accepted religion on all its subjects. This made the cantons religious as well as political divisions of the population. The league between the cantons established no relations between their inhabitants: citizens of one canton were treated as aliens in every other, and special treaties were required to enable the citizens of any canton to acquire a domicile or hold property in other cantons. Under this traditional constitution, based on aristocracy and religious differences, without national unity, religious liberty, or civil equality, the Swiss people had neither political life nor the means of reforming their condition. "The Swiss," said Goethe, "having delivered themselves from one tyrant, have fancied themselves free; but from the carcass of the oppressor the sun has caused a swarm of petty tyrants to spring up."

The French invasion of 1798 made an end of the old condition of affairs. The Helvetic Republic, modelled on the French Republic, established a central government and civil equality of all citizens. This was the first experience of a Swiss nation. It was also the origin of civil wars which lasted five years.* The revolutionary principle of unity and equality found few defenders outside the Vaudois, a people of French blood previously subject to Berne. The Bernese and the people of the mountain cantons resisted the new order of things with passionate energy.

Napoleon ended the war by imposing a compromise on the contending parties. The Act of Mediation of 1803 restored the sovereignty of the cantons by restricting the Diet to foreign and military affairs, and making the deputies subject to the instructions of their cantons. But he maintained equality by giving the title of Canton to the districts formerly recognised only as *allied*, and even to the subject districts; † also by requiring each canton to adopt a constitution in conformity with French principles—

* These contests, and the very interesting experiments in constitution-making in this period, are very clearly described in Hilty's "*Oeffentliche Vorlesungen über die Helvetische Republik.*"

† The six new cantons were Aargau, Thurgau, Vaud, Ticino, Saint-Gall, and the Grisons.

civil equality, religious liberty, freedom of commerce and of domicile. The ancient little cantons of the High Alps retained their old assembly of the citizens (*Landsgemeinde*), meeting in the open air once a year to make their laws. The larger cantons adopted modern constitutions, with representative assemblies elected by the property owners. This new Switzerland had little political life, as it was dependent on Napoleon, whose chief concern with it was to get soldiers. (Ten thousand Swiss perished in the Russian campaign.) But at least the Swiss began under him an apprenticeship in individual liberty and equality, and in national spirit.

Period of the Restoration (1814-30).—When the allied armies entered Switzerland the partisans of the old *régime* rose to re-establish the old cantonal governments and the old league. They succeeded in gaining control, first in the aristocratic cantons of Berne and Soleure, then in the Catholic cantons, Freiburg, Lucerne, the three forest cantons, and Zug. At Berne the government that was in office in 1798 was restored, and declared the Act of Mediation null. The federal Diet was sitting in 1814 at Zurich (it alternated yearly between the six principal cities). The eight cantons favouring the reaction withdrew their representatives and formed a separate Diet at Lucerne. There they demanded a return to the old constitution. Berne and Uri demanded back their former subjects. Schwytz and Unterwalden aspired to go back to the beginning of Swiss history: the ancient agreements should first be renewed between the three forest cantons, then that with Lucerne, then those with the other cantons, in the order in which they had been made originally.

The new constitution was supported by the other cantons, especially by the new ones, whose very existence was threatened. Switzerland found herself divided into two hostile leagues, each represented by a Diet. Civil war was on the eve of breaking out. It was the sovereigns of Europe who stopped it and saved the work of Napoleon. The Tsar had had two Vaudois friends, Laharpe and Jomini; he declared himself against the restoration. The old *régime* governments, too weak to accomplish their objects without help, abandoned their claims on their former subjects, offering to accept a money indemnity. The allies gave Berne, by way of compensation, the district of Bienne and the old bishopric of Bâle, a Catholic country that had formed the French department of Mont-Terrible, and later became the Bernese Jura.

The eight seceding cantons returned to the Diet. Three new cantons, taken from the French Empire, were added—Geneva, Neuchâtel, and Valais. This Diet of 22 cantons laboured seventeen months in making a constitution—the Federal Pact of August 7, 1815, made after bitter contests regarding the old subject districts. The Great Powers ratified it, and guaranteed the neutrality of Switzerland—which might furnish occasion for interfering in its internal affairs.

The system established in 1815 differed little from the Act of Mediation. The cantons were sovereign, retaining all the powers not expressly given to the confederation. They had the postal service, the coinage, civil rights, and the power of making commercial treaties with foreign nations. The confederation had only diplomatic and military affairs and the settlement of difficulties between cantons. The Diet was not an assembly of representatives of the people, but a meeting of delegates from the cantonal governments.* It sat alternately in the three leading cantons, Berne, Zurich, and Lucerne. The canton in which its sessions were held in any given year was called the *Vorort*; its executive council acted as a federal executive for the time. Switzerland was not yet a federal state; it was a federation of states. Its constitution was only a "federal pact" between sovereign states. The inhabitants of one canton were not even given the right of residence in other cantons; for this, special agreements between the governments of the cantons were necessary. On this point the "Pact of 1815" returned to the old system.

Each canton settled at will its own internal constitution, each had its own special institutions. Neglecting minor differences we may classify the cantonal constitutions into five groups:

First. The little mountain cantons, Uri, Schwytz, Unterwalden, the two halves of Appenzell, Zug, and Glarus, retained the old government by the *Landsgemeinde*, or yearly open-air assembly of the men of the canton. This decided public questions and chose the executive officers.

Second. The ancient leagues—Grisons and Valais—remained subordinate confederations. The Grisons had a central *Grand Council* of 65 delegates—27 from the *Ligue Grise* (*Graubund*), 25

* The delegates were bound by their instructions, and their consent to measures was only provisional, *ad referendum*, *ad instruendum*, or *ad ratificandum*. Their sessions were secret.

from the *Ligue Cadée* (*Gotteshausbund*), and 13 from the League of the Ten Jurisdictions. These delegates had to follow the instructions of the districts they represented, each of which had an almost sovereign assembly. Valais was divided into 13 *Dizains*, each of which had a council elected by the communes; the power of the League was exercised by a Diet composed of four delegates from each dizain, and four votes for the Bishop of Sion.

Third. The old aristocratic cantons, Berne, Lucerne, Zurich, Freiburg, Soleure, Bâle, Schaffhausen, and Geneva, had commonly a Grand Council empowered to exercise the sovereign power and a Lesser Council for executive business—both usually composed of members of the old families.

Fourth. The new cantons, St. Gall, Aargau, Thurgau, Vaud, and Ticino had elected Councils, elected, however, by the property owners.

Fifth. Neuchâtel kept its Prince, the King of Prussia, who by the Constitutional Charter established two councils, the *Executive Council of State* and the *Audience General*—the latter made up in part of nominees of the Prince and in part of elected members.

Save in the mountain cantons, all the governments established political inequality between the inhabitants. The people of the chief-place, who made the constitutions, had followed a very old custom by so regulating the election of the councils as to give themselves always a majority against the rest of the canton, even where the rest of the canton far outnumbered them in population. Further, a majority of the members from the chief-place were, in the case of the aristocratic cantons, chosen by the old families. . . .

In the new cantons, where the chief-place had not the habit of ruling, the constitutions established elective councils, giving roughly half of the members to the rest of the canton. But the difference of wealth gave inequality of power, according to a principle accepted at that time throughout Europe. The right of electing was reserved to the heavier taxpayers. Besides, there was systematic effort to limit the action of the voters by several devices. The representatives were chosen for very long periods, so as to make the elections as infrequent as possible. Indirect election was established. The election procedure was intentionally complicated. The Grand Council of Vaud was composed of 180 members elected for 12 years, and renewable by thirds; 63 chosen by the Grand Council itself from a list of candidates pre-

pared by the districts, 36 by a body of electors, 63 chosen directly by the voters, 18 elected by the district assemblies. The maxim of the Liberals of that day was: everything for the people, nothing by the people.

Every canton was supreme in questions of Church and school. Several forbade any form of worship other than that established by the state. Valais did not allow Protestant worship; Vaud did not allow Catholic worship. Even in the cantons that had religious toleration it was the clergy who controlled marriage and registered births and deaths.

Under these aristocratic and sectarian constitutions public activity was weak until about 1829. Some institutions—the Federal Military School of Thoune (1818), the Swiss Society of Natural Sciences, the Students' Association, and the Federal Shooting-matches—mark nevertheless the beginning of a better feeling between citizens of the different cantons. But the chief political business was the supervision of foreign refugees. Switzerland was an asylum for the proscribed. Newspapers hostile to the European governments were published there. The Great Powers made complaints, and the government of Berne induced the Diet to vote the "Conclusum" of 1823, which required the cantons to "prohibit in newspapers and periodicals everything that could offend the powers in friendly relations with Switzerland" and to prevent "persons escaped from another state, after having committed there offences against the public peace, from entering into, or sojourning upon, the territory of the confederation." Every foreigner was to furnish a certificate from the authorities of his own country. Several cantons even established a censorship of the press. This "conclusum," voted for a year, was renewed annually until 1829. This measure of Absolutist police was the only important federal act.

The Regeneration (1829-37).—In 1829 a series of agitations, revolutions, and civil wars began which lasted until the general war of 1847. The Swiss have called it the period of regeneration.

The Swiss, who, until that time, had received their political impulses from abroad, took themselves the initiative in constitutional reform. As early as 1829 a democratic party appeared which laboured to amend the constitutions of the cantons and then the constitution of the confederation. It was made up chiefly from the classes left out of account by the government and took presently the name of Radical party. The movement,

begun in 1829, was stimulated by the French Revolution of 1830. In nearly all the cantons the inhabitants gathered and drew up petitions asking for revision of the constitutions. Neither revolutions nor outbreaks were necessary; the governments were alarmed and granted revision.

The centre of the agitation was Zurich. A fugitive German professor, Snell, founded there a journal called the *Swiss Republican* and drew up the "memorial of Kussnacht," which embodied the program of the party: sovereignty of the people, universal suffrage, and direct election.

One by one eleven cantons, the most populous, amended their constitutions peaceably. The Radical program demanded sovereignty of the people, universal suffrage, equality of rights, separation of the powers, publicity of the debates, liberty of the press, right of petition, freedom of opinion, of residence, and of industry. The revised constitutions admitted nearly all these principles. . . . Exceptions worth noting were that Lucerne, Zurich, and Schaffhausen preserved the over-representation of the capital city, that Berne retained the property qualification for voting, and Freiburg retained indirect election.

The federal Diet had decided, December, 1830, not to intervene in any way in the constitutional changes of the cantons. It was forced, however, to intervene to restore order in the cantons where serious dissensions arose. In Schwytz, the external districts, having failed to gain equality, had seceded, and drawn up a constitution as a new canton; they even attempted to surprise the government garrison. The Diet condemned their action as a breach of the peace and sent federal troops to put them down. At Bâle, the government, composed of city people, having drawn up a constitution which accorded larger representation to the city than to the rural districts, the rural communes had voted against it: the government took revenge by withdrawing their right of self-government. The communes answered by declaring themselves independent of the city, and drawing up a constitution as a separate canton. The city resorted to military force to put down the movement; but the Diet supported the rural communes, and Bâle was divided into two sovereign half-cantons, Bâle-city and Bâle-country (1833).

The regenerated cantons wished the confederation to be regenerated also, in order to strengthen the federal government and proclaim the sovereignty of the people. The German cantons, taking the lead, formed, in March, 1832, the "Siebener-

concordat," a league of seven cantons for mutual defence against attempts at reaction. They pledged themselves to maintain the rights and liberties of the people, to sustain the lawful authorities and defend their new constitutions by force of arms. This league was to labour for a revision of the federal constitution, in order to have the cantonal constitutions protected by the federal government; the Concordat was to lapse when the confederation should have assumed this responsibility.

The cantons attached to the old system answered by a counter league, the Sarnerbund, formed November, 1832, between Neuchâtel, Bâle, Valais, and the three forest cantons. These agreed not to send their representatives to the Diet, in order to hinder revision. The Diet, where the regenerated cantons had a majority, dissolved the league and compelled the members of it to send their deputies as usual. Then it voted in favour of amending the constitution. A draft of the amendments was submitted to the cantons, but failed of adoption because the people in two of the regenerated cantons rejected them. No new draft was agreed on, and so the project of revision was abandoned. The main result of the movement was to lead the Diet to make its sessions public.

After the failure of revision the political life of the cantons was filled with confused movements. Three of these may be noted:

First. A new division of political parties came about. Till then the division was into Liberals and Conservatives; after the attempted revision the Liberals divided. The more eager wished to continue the revolution and establish political equality throughout Switzerland: these formed the Radical party, resting on the general mass of the voters. On the other hand, the men who, during the revision movement, had conducted the governments, regarded the revolution as ended and became the party of the *just mean*, opposing further changes: this was the party of the middle class, the statesmen, the jurists, and the educated classes in general.* But it failed to develop strength; it held aloof from political agitation and gradually lost its influence with the masses. The Radical party was managed by a general asso-

* Rohmers has expressed the views of this party in a theory, or rather a metaphor, which a well-known writer, Bluntschli, adopts in his work on *the state*: "There are four parties, corresponding to the four ages of man: two extremes—the *radical*, who is the ignorant child, the *absolutist*, who is the decrepit old man; two intermediate parties of political wisdom—the *liberal*, who is the young man, and the *conservative*, the mature man."

ciation, the *National Verein*; it went on agitating for revision and gathered to itself young men of the new generation.

Second. The reactions that followed, throughout the Continent, the movements of 1830, filled Switzerland with political refugees accused in their own countries of conspiracy. . . Demands for their expulsion led to contests in Switzerland, the Radicals supporting the refugees in the name of Swiss independence and democratic principles; the Liberals supported the demands of the foreign governments and, joining the Conservatives, carried through the Diet a provision for a central police to exercise surveillance over the refugees.

Third. A transformation came about in the Catholic cantons. A Catholic party was formed which put the religious question before political questions. It found its support not among the aristocratic Conservatives, but among the peasants, and avowed itself a democratic party. It sought, by the help of the rural voters, to deprive the Liberals of control.

Local Conflicts (1837-45).—Troubles broke out regarding ecclesiastical affairs. German Switzerland belonged, until 1815, to the diocese of Constance. The Swiss governments, unwilling to be subject to a foreign bishop, obtained, after long negotiations, the creation of six Swiss bishoprics directly subject to the Pope. Certain Liberal governments agreed in the Articles of Baden to place the relations between Church and state under sovereign control of the lay power. The Pope condemned the Articles as contrary to the constitution of the Church. There were outbreaks of the Catholic inhabitants against the commands of the Protestant governments in Aargau, Saint-Gall, and Bernese Jura.

In several cantons there were armed conflicts on various questions. There was a fight in Schwytz regarding the use of common pastures (*Allmende*). The owners of large cattle, nicknamed *Horns*, came to the Assembly of the canton armed with clubs; their opponents, the owners of small cattle, nicknamed *Split-hoofs* (*Klauen*) were unarmed. There was a vote, and the vote was doubted. The *Horns* dispersed the *Split-hoofs* with their clubs. There was a battle with guns in Ticino, and the Radicals won the day. In Valais the Radicals had long demanded equality of representation for Lower Valais; in 1838 they got proceedings started for a revision of the constitution. The Diet supported them and ordered the election of a convention to frame a constitution. Upper Valais, to save its privileges, wished to be made a separate canton, but this the Diet refused.

The new constitution was submitted to popular vote: Lower Valais gave a majority of 8000 in its favour; Upper Valais, according to its own claim, gave a majority of 10,770 votes against it. This was evidently a fraudulent claim. The Radicals of Lower Valais made an armed invasion of Upper Valais and forced it to accept the constitution (1840).

Of all the petty wars of the period the most characteristic is the "affray of Zurich." The Radical governments had called to the University of Zurich a German professor, the famous rationalist Strauss, author of the "Life of Jesus." The pastors, aroused, organized a *Committee of the Faith*, which demanded the recall of the appointment. The government retired Strauss, but declared that it could not allow the committee to hold communal assemblies. The committee protested and held a meeting of 15,000 persons. Early in the morning of September 6, 1839, four or five thousand men, brought together by the pastors of Pfaffikon, on the border of the lake, marched on Zurich. At their head were five hundred men armed with guns; the rest carried scythes and flails. During that year Zurich, as Vorort, was the seat of the Diet, and its council was therefore acting as the federal executive. To defend this government there were in the city only 190 foot soldiers and 30 horsemen. One volley was enough to stop the insurgents; but forthwith the troops were withdrawn to their barracks. The citizens responsible for the care of the arsenals handed them over to the insurgents and the members of the council resigned their offices. The insurgents, masters of Zurich, established a provisional council, which found itself invested with the federal executive power. Thus a petty cantonal insurrection sufficed to change the directory of the confederation.

Amid these conflicts the intermediate parties, Conservatives and Liberals, lost gradually their control of the cantons; power was passing to the two extreme parties. In the Protestant cantons the Radicals were taking the place of the old families.* In the Catholic cantons, the Democratic Catholic party was displacing the champions of lay sovereignty. The Jesuits directed

* At Geneva, Fazy, the Radical leader, had to make a coalition with the Catholics of the rural communes, in order to oust the patricians from the government. A rising was required in 1841 to obtain the constitutional convention that prepared the democratic constitution of 1842; a revolution was needed in 1846 to drive the patrician leaders from the councils and obtain the Constitution of 1847.

the movement, and took advantage of it to found colleges in Schwytz, Freiburg, and Lucerne. The party got control in Freiburg in 1837 and in Lucerne in 1841. By 17,555 votes against 1679 the people of Lucerne voted the Democratic Catholic constitution, giving the city and rural districts equal representation, abrogating the Articles of Baden, and suppressing lay supervision of schools. The new government submitted this constitution to the Pope for his approval. In Valais, after a bloody struggle, the victorious Catholics made a constitution which forbade all other forms of worship than the Catholic (1844).

The political forces gradually grouped themselves into two parties, the Catholics and their opponents, without reference to cantonal lines. The Protestant government of Aargau, after a Catholic outbreak in opposition, suppressed the eight convents in the canton; the Catholics got a decision from the Diet annulling the action as contrary to the federal constitution. Aargau accepted, in 1843, a compromise re-establishing the convents for women; but in 1844 it demanded of the Diet the expulsion of the Jesuits. Battalions of volunteers were formed in Lucerne, and armed from the federal arsenals, to oppose the Catholic government; they were commanded by Ochsenbein, later chief of the staff in the federal army. Twice they marched upon the city, but were beaten (1844-45). The government of Lucerne condemned such of them as were captured to punishment as ordinary criminals.

The Sonderbund and the Civil War (1845-47).—The Swiss were divided into two extreme parties, ready for war with each other. The Catholic party gave official form to the division by forming a Separate Union (Sonderbund) between the seven Catholic cantons, Uri, Schwytz, Unterwalden, Zug, Lucerne, Freiburg, and Valais (1845). These cantons agreed, "in case one or more of their number should be attacked, to repel the attack in common"; they represented their action as taken "in defence of their sovereignty and territorial rights"; their league as a defensive one, modelled on the ancient alliances. They instituted a council of war of seven delegates which should take the necessary measures to defend the cantons. Each canton contributed to the defence fund in the proportion of its federal burdens.

The Radical party called on the Diet to expel the Jesuits and dissolve the Sonderbund. This meant war. Several cantons hesitated; in order to obtain a majority in the Diet, the Radicals

laboured to overturn the cantonal governments that wished to remain neutral. They made the expulsion of the Jesuits the primary question of Swiss politics. Taking advantage of the unpopularity of the Jesuits to compromise the governments suspected of favouring them, they succeeded in getting into power in Vaud, Berne, Geneva, and Saint-Gall. The control of the votes of these cantons gave them a majority in the federal Diet. They carried through the Diet an order dissolving the *Sonderbund*, and a vote asking the cantons to expel the Jesuits. The cantons of the *Sonderbund* decided to resist, and recalled their deputies from the Diet.

The Diet gave the direction of the war to General Dufour, a Conservative. In November, 1847, he had 100,000 men and 172 cannons. The *Sonderbund* had only 30,000 men and 74 cannons. But they counted on the weakness of the Diet, the ease of defence in their mountains, and the likelihood of intervention from without. The four great powers (Austria, Prussia, Russia, and France) promised to intervene for the maintenance of the Pact of 1815 and the sovereignty of the cantons placed under their guarantee. The council of war of the *Sonderbund* received 400,000 florins from Austria and 3000 guns and some cannon from Louis Philippe. The Diet, having received from the English government a secret intimation that the great powers were going to intervene, ordered that operations should be rapidly pushed. Dufour, concentrating all his forces, marched on Freiburg, which yielded without fighting (November 14), then on Zug, then on Lucerne. The army of the *Sonderbund* dispersed, and Lucerne was taken November 24. The forest cantons had no choice but to capitulate. Later Valais was reduced to submission. The campaign had lasted only three weeks. The offer of mediation by the European powers did not arrive till all was over.

The *Sonderbund* war was a war of principles between a centralizing lay policy and a cantonal sectarian policy. The Jesuits and other religious orders were expelled from each canton occupied by the federal troops. Then the people were compelled to admit the Radicals to power, to withdraw from the *Sonderbund*, and amend the cantonal constitution. At Freiburg, the new Council, taken from the Radical minority, amended the constitution and governed the canton, contrary to democratic principles, without consulting the mass of the people, who were known to be hostile to the revolution.

The Radicals, by defeating the Catholics, acquired the mastery of Switzerland, and have continued to hold it.

The Federal Constitution of 1848.—The victorious Radicals reorganized Switzerland according to their own ideas. The Diet appointed a committee to draft a new constitution—the Constitution of 1848. This established a Federal State (*Bundesstaat*) instead of the Federation of States (*Staatenbund*) created by the Pact of 1815. It retained the formula “The people of the 22 sovereign Cantons form the Swiss Confederation” and copied from the discarded Articles of Confederation of the United States the assertion that the Cantons are sovereign and exercise all the rights not conferred on the federal power. But it required the cantons to ask of the Confederation the guarantee of their constitutions, and determined the conditions to which these must conform:

1. That these constitutions shall contain nothing contrary to the provisions of the federal constitution.
2. That they shall insure the enjoyment of political rights according to republican forms (representative or democratic).
3. That they shall have been accepted by the people, and shall have a provision for amendment when demanded by a majority of the voters.

All political alliances are forbidden between the cantons.

There are thus principles and political forms binding for all the Swiss, a supreme federal public law which gives political unity to Switzerland. This supreme law conforms to Radical doctrine; it tolerates none but republican governments (Neuchâtel declares itself independent of the King of Prussia), democratic governments resting on universal suffrage, republics in which the constitution must be submitted to popular vote, and must be open to amendment on demand of the majority. The Swiss's country is no longer only his canton but all Switzerland. Before 1848 any person expelled from his canton became *heimatslos*, a man without a country; henceforth every Swiss enjoys civil rights throughout the whole extent of the Confederation. The federal constitution guarantees to him equality of rights, freedom of marriage, of commerce, of industry, of the press, of association, and of worship.

The constitution divides the powers between the canton and the Confederation. The canton retains its power of legislation in civil and penal matters, in affairs of police, public worship, education, public highways, military service, in the appointment of

officers, and in taxation; but it is subject to the federal laws. The Confederation has power to manage foreign relations, the army, customs duties, postal affairs, and the coinage. Henceforward Switzerland has some institutions in common—one postal system, one tariff (all internal customs duties were abolished), one federal coinage, one federal system of weights and measures (the French metric system), a federal army directed by a central general staff. The Swiss army, reorganized in the revision of 1874, is a national force, recruited by a universal compulsory service for short terms (42 to 80 days). Young men pass in it only the time necessary for learning to manage arms and to execute military movements, under the command of officers who remain ordinary citizens.

The new constitution institutes three organs of government, invested with the three powers recognised by the theories in vogue at that time. The Federal Assembly exercises "the legislative power." The Federal Council, composed of seven members elected for three years by the Assembly, holds "the executive power"; each of the seven takes charge of a department; one of the seven, designated each year by the Assembly, acts as President of the Council. The Federal Tribunal, elected by the Assembly, has "the judicial power," but has not the right, as in America, to disregard legislative acts that are, in its judgment, contrary to the constitution.

The Federal Assembly is not a single body representing the Swiss people, as the democratic school demanded; it is composed, on the model of the United States, of two Chambers: the National Council, elected directly by all the voters, in the proportion of one for every 20,000 inhabitants; and the Council of States (Ständerath), composed of two members from each canton. For the election of the Federal Council and the judges of the Federal Tribunal the two houses meet as one body. The members of both councils receive pay for their services, the members of the Council of States receiving it from their cantons. The federal government has a fixed residence assigned to it, the city of Berne, which becomes the federal capital.

By its tenderness for the forms of cantonal sovereignty, and by the division of the Federal Assembly, the Constitution of 1848 is a compromise between the traditional independence of the cantons and the ideal of centralization urged by the Radical party. The Committee of Revision expressed this point clearly in its report: "If Switzerland is no longer in the condition for

which the Pact of 1815 was instituted, no more is it in a condition suitable for a unitary government—a new Helvetic Republic. . . . Whatever advance the national spirit may have made, the cantonal spirit is still deeply ingrained in Switzerland. The unitary system might perhaps be introduced, but it could not be maintained. . . .”

The constitution was submitted to popular vote and was declared to have been adopted by the people of fifteen cantons and one half-canton. In this number Freiburg is included, although there had been no popular vote there—the Radical Council undertaking to answer for the people (see p. 268). In four cantons, where a majority of the votes actually cast was against the new constitution, a majority in its favour was made out by adding to the minority voting *yes* the votes of those who had failed to take part in the election.*

The Swiss nation dates from the Constitution of 1848. The unity established by the Radicals has not been disputed; civil wars have ceased; † the Swiss of all the cantons have become accustomed to regard each other as fellow-countrymen, and to govern themselves according to the same democratic spirit. Coinciding with the introduction of railways, the constitution ushered in a period of unwonted prosperity. The people of Switzerland, proverbial up to that date for rustic qualities, have since made themselves notable for their manufactures, for the comfort everywhere observable among them, for the perfection of their schools and for their political training. The population has increased from 2,390,000 in 1850 to 3,300,000 in 1896.

Establishment of Direct Popular Legislation.—After 1848 the history of Switzerland is no longer made up of revolutions, risings, and civil wars: these are replaced by amendments of the constitution. From 1830 to 1873 there were eighty-three constitutional changes in the cantons, and the movement still goes on. All the cantonal constitutions have been remodelled; there remains now only one of earlier date than 1848; the oldest, that of Berne, made in 1846, was modified in 1893.

The thing that gives interest to this movement is a phenomenon unique in history—the experiment of direct legislative action by the people. This has been introduced in two forms—

* The four were Schwytz, Zug, Valais, and Lucerne. All the Catholic cantons had given majorities against the new constitution.

† The only exceptions have been the royalist attempt in Neuchâtel in 1856, and certain fights in the Italian canton of Ticino.

the Initiative and the Referendum. The Initiative is the right granted to any sufficiently numerous group of citizens to propose a change of law, and to require the government to submit the question to the judgment of the people. The *Referendum* is the right given to the people to have a direct vote on any bill passed by the legislature. These two contrivances aim to give the people a direct voice in the making of laws; they constitute a system wholly new in Europe. In the representative governments of European states, the people have only a general political power; they are only choosers of men to govern. In all the Swiss cantons, since 1848, the people, in addition to this right of choosing their governing agents, have the right of collaborating in making the constitution, and in many cantons in the passage of laws.

In order to understand the very complicated history of this innovation, we must rigorously distinguish: 1. Between the *Initiative* and the *Referendum*; 2. Between constitutions and laws; 3. Between federal and cantonal institutions.

Initiative and Referendum in Changing the Constitution.—The Radicals, as early as 1830, laid down the principle that the people alone have the right to ordain their constitution; that a representative assembly ought not exercise this power, its only function being to draw up a draft for acceptance by the people. This principle came down from the Helvetic Republic of 1798, which got it from the French republicans in the *plébiscite* of ratification. All the cantonal constitutions made after 1830 declared the approval of the people to be essential for establishing or amending a constitution (Freiburg, the sole exception, did not adopt the doctrine till 1857).

This principle of popular sovereignty led, by inevitable consequence, to the right of *Initiative*. This is, at bottom, the right to demand that the people be allowed to say whether they wish a change of constitution. In most of the constitutions made from 1830 to 1848 the doctrine is not found; the representative assemblies have the right of proposing changes. Only a few cantons (Schaffhausen, Aargau, Bâle-country) ordained that a petition from a certain number of citizens should oblige the government to consult the people. Further, the "men of the just mean" (p. 264), partisans of constitutional stability, who had drafted most of the new constitutions, had inserted in them a clause prohibiting changes till after the lapse of a certain period. The result was to compel the people to violate the constitutions

by bringing about changes before the end of the term set. The right of initiative thus became recognised as the Radicals obtained sway.

In 1848 the federal constitution made the Radical doctrine public law in Switzerland. It declared that every constitution needs to be accepted by the people (this is the *Referendum*) and ought to have a provision for amendment "when a majority of the citizens demand it" (this is the *Initiative*). Some cantons later made the initiative easier to exercise by providing that a certain number of citizens might present a demand for revision.

The principles laid down for the cantonal constitutions by this Constitution of 1848 were applied to the federal system also. The federal constitution was submitted for the approval of the people, and did not go into effect until it had been accepted by a majority both of the voters and of the cantons. It could be changed at any time on the initiative of 50,000 voters (in 1874 this number was reduced to 30,000). It was not thought necessary in 1848 to provide for the case of single amendments; an amendment was adopted in 1891 which obliges the federal government to submit to popular vote any amendment proposed by 50,000 voters. So a constitutional amendment drawn up by a private individual and indorsed by 50,000 voters must be presented for the judgment of the whole body of citizens, no matter what the opinion of the Assembly; and if it receives a majority of the voters and of the cantons, it becomes part of the constitution. (A canton is held to approve if its voters give a majority in favour.)

Initiative and Referendum in Ordinary Legislation.—Direct intervention in making ordinary laws does not seem at first blush a necessary consequence of popular sovereignty. The representative legislature is regarded as the lawmaking power. So the evolution was slower here than in the case of the constitution.

The first movement was made in 1831 by the council charged with drawing up a constitution for St. Gall, and it was made in the name of a philosophic theory. Major Diog, a disciple of Hegel, demanded for the people the right of ratifying the laws. "For me," he said, "the main question is on what principle our work ought to proceed. I know but one principle—the sovereignty of the people. The sovereign is supreme; his will is law. I hear of a representative sovereignty, but persons exercising a delegated power are not sovereign. We have heard that the people are to control their own affairs; but if the Grand Council

is to be a guardian over them, they have not such control." When the advantages of the representative system were urged in reply, he answered: "There is a tendency here to take the welfare of the people as the fundamental principle; but the question is of rights, not of welfare. If it were of welfare we might be told that constitutional monarchy would be best." The debate ended in a compromise. It was decided that all laws passed by the Grand Council should be subject to the approval of the people; but only if this were demanded within a certain time. This potential or optional referendum was called the *veto*, in memory of the Roman Tribunes. But in this timid form the legislative Referendum had no great success in Saint-Gall: there were 9190 voters in favour of the constitution and 11,091 against it; 12,692 voters failed to cast their votes. These latter were treated as having voted *yes*, and the constitution was declared adopted.

The *veto*, introduced at Lucerne in 1841, was compromised in the eyes of the Radicals by the use the Catholic party made of it. It reappeared under the name of the Referendum. This was an old word with a new meaning. In the old Swiss Confederation and in the Grisons and Valais, which were themselves federations, the delegates were simply agents, not sovereign legislators. In the federal Diet they discussed but did not decide; they met *ad audiendum et referendum*, to hear propositions and refer them to their constituents. In popular usage the word *referendum* came to mean the decision given by the people on the propositions brought to them by their envoys. This old *referendum* disappeared; the Grisons, which kept it till 1853, was compelled by the federal government to discontinue it as contrary to the Constitution of 1848, because the votes were counted by communes and not by the simple number of individuals for and against. But the word referendum had begun to be used for the right of the people to reject the acts passed by their representatives.

At first there was only the optional *referendum*. Any act passed by the representative assembly was binding: the people had simply the right of demanding that it be put to general vote; and they could only accept or reject the whole act. The optional *referendum* was still only the *veto*.

The small ancient cantons of the mountains had from time immemorial practised direct government by the assembled people (*Landsgemeinde*). Once a year the people gathered in the open air on a spot consecrated by tradition. The government pre-

sented bills and the people voted on them by show of hands; thus the people made their laws directly. The government had not even the exclusive right of proposing bills; any citizen had the right to propose a bill, and a vote of the people was enough to make it a law. (In Uri it was requisite that seven citizens of seven different families should unite in proposing). Six cantons retained this system till 1848. But it was practicable only with a small body of citizens deciding very simple questions. Schwytz and Zug replaced it by a representative assembly. The general meeting has been preserved in two cantons, Uri and Glaris, and in four half-cantons, the two Unterwaldens and the two Appenzells.

In practice the optional *referendum* was little more than a fiction; the right of the people to the legislative power was affirmed in principle, but it was only on special occasions that the right was brought into play; the laws continued to be made by the representative assembly. The cantons having the *Landsgemeinde* were the only ones in which the people voted directly on all legislation. There was much hesitation in the other cantons about giving the people the means of really expressing their judgment on all proposed laws. A beginning was timidly made with a *referendum* confined to financial affairs. On the occasion of building a railway, Neuchâtel, in 1858, made the referendum obligatory for any appropriation of 500,000 francs or upwards; Valais adopted it in 1861 for any sum exceeding a million of francs. The first complete experiment of the obligatory referendum in the passage of laws was made by Bâle-country, a half-canton: its Constitution of 1863 ordained that twice a year the government must submit to vote of the citizens all laws and decrees of general concern.

Side by side with the movement leading to the obligatory referendum, the Radical party had carried on an agitation for the right of popular Initiative. The idea first appeared in the canton of Vaud, in connection with the change of constitution of 1845. There were there, it was said, especially among the workmen of Vevey, revolutionists connected with the French secret societies of the time; their opponents reproached them with reading Buonarotti and with holding communistic principles. These men proposed to provide in the new constitution for the "Organization of Labour." The council which drew up the constitution rejected the idea; but it took a new step in the direction of popular initiative, by providing that any measure urged by

8000 citizens should be examined by the Grand Council and submitted to the assemblies of the communes.

The Initiative was adopted in 1848 by the two cantons which abolished their *Landsgemeinde* (Schwytz and Zug); in 1852 it was adopted by Aargau. It began at that time to be regarded as the complement of the referendum. Bâle-country, in 1863, gave to any 1500 voters the right to propose changes of law. The people thus got, not only the right to reject measures proposed by others, but to propose measures themselves. From that time onward the two institutions, the Initiative and the Referendum, were ordinarily advocated by the same party, and were incorporated together in every new constitution. Both rest on the principle of direct government by the people. The voters are not only the makers of constitutions—they are the true lawmakers, proposing laws by the initiative and adopting them by the referendum.

This system has step by step won acceptance in all the cantons—sometimes in the incomplete form of optional referendum, or with a restriction to financial measures. The decisive success was at Zurich's revision of her constitution in 1869. The committee managing the reform movement, in demanding the referendum and initiative, had stated the case succinctly: "The question is of converting our apparent sovereignty into a real sovereignty of the people, to transfer the dominant power and force from the hands of a few to the strong shoulders of the community." The people supported the proposal. In the convention called to draw up the new constitution, Suter, a Liberal, proposed to confine themselves to the *veto*. Someone made answer: "In the ship of state, as Suter would arrange matters, the Grand Council would hold the tiller while the sovereign, on the wharf, would watch it directing the ship. That is contempt of the people, of its ability to manage the ship of state. We, on the contrary, have full confidence in the people. The referendum and initiative are new rights. . . . In opposition to the representative system, a new period of direct democratic legislation by the people has begun. And Mr. Suter has just told us that the Grand Council is, in the first instance, the holder of the legislative power, the people being only auxiliaries in the work. We, on the contrary, say that the legislative power resides in the people, and in exercising the power, they use the help of the Grand Council."

The Constitution of 1869 dropped the title of Grand Council,

and declared that the people of Zurich exercise the legislative power, "with the assistance of the Cantonal Council." The Cantonal Council has no other function than to prepare bills. Every bill presented by the initiative of 5000 citizens or supported by one-third of the members of the Cantonal Council, is required to be submitted to the people. Twice a year the people assemble by communes and vote on all such bills. The bills are divided into three categories: 1. Constitutional amendments, laws, concordats. 2. Bills which the Council is incompetent to pass definitively. 3. Bills which the Council is empowered to enact, but which it prefers to submit to popular vote.*

This system was quickly adopted by most of the other large German cantons, Thurgau, Soleure, Berne (without the initiative), Lucerne in 1869. It was computed that in 1860 1,030,000 inhabitants of Switzerland lived under a purely representative system, and that in 1870 the number was only 330,000.

The movement has gone on, but more slowly. In 1889 there remained but one canton, Freiburg, without any form of direct popular action in making laws. There were still four cantons retaining the *Landsgemeinde*, six and a half cantons having the obligatory referendum and initiative, four and a half having the initiative and optional referendum, and six having restricted forms of the one or the other.

Federal Constitutional Changes.—The Radicals, while establishing the legislative referendum in the cantons, were urging its introduction into the federal system also. The first effort to carry the point failed; amendments embodying the scheme were rejected by the people in 1865. In 1869 a majority of the National Council voted that the constitution ought to be brought "into harmony with the needs of the time." As in 1848, the Radical party wished to increase the powers of the federal government. The draft of a constitution approved by the two Houses in 1872 placed under federal control the civil law, railroads, public schools, liberty of worship, emigration agencies, insurance, etc. It also established the referendum and the initiative.

Then appeared an opposition, alive since 1798 but overshadowed by the struggle for democratic institutions, be-

* In the German cantons, where the politicians are educated in the German public law, little attention is paid to the distinction between the constitution and ordinary laws. This is particularly true of constitutional amendments.

tween those desiring a strong national government and the champions of cantonal rights. The National or Unitary party is made up in the main from the German Protestant cantons; being radical and free from clerical domination, it inclines to unify the institutions of all Switzerland and to intervene in the government of the cantons to establish purely lay education. The Cantonalist party is made up of two sets of men, who dislike the federal power for two different reasons. The French Protestant cantons, radical and free from clerical control, wish to preserve their administrative autonomy and their Latin customs, which they believe to be threatened by the German majority. The Catholic cantons, though almost exclusively German, defend clerical control of the schools against the German Radicals.

In 1872 the coalition of the French and Catholic cantons defeated the new constitution: the vote stood 256,000 voters and 9 cantons in favour, 260,000 voters and 13 cantons against. The National Council at once drafted a new scheme, in which, to conciliate the French cantons, private law was omitted from the subjects under federal jurisdiction, and the cantons retained control of their troops; but the referendum and the provision for secular schools were retained: "The cantons shall provide for public schools, which shall be adequate and placed exclusively under the control of the civil authority. Education shall be compulsory and, in the public schools, gratuitous. The public schools shall be so conducted as to be capable of being attended by the adherents of all religions. The Confederation shall take measures against any canton not fulfilling this obligation." This time the French cantons joined the German ones; the Catholics were left alone. The Constitution of 1874 was adopted by 340,000 votes and 14½ cantons in favour, against 198,000 votes and 7½ cantons opposed. There were 214 voters for every 1000 inhabitants—an exceptional proportion. The constitution established the referendum in the optional form—the request of 30,000 voters being required in order to have any given bill put to the popular vote. It had no provision for the initiative, even in proposing amendment of the constitution.

The federal referendum instituted in 1874 has been frequently used and has caused the rejection of a number of bills after their passage by the legislative bodies. It has been used as a means of bringing a coalition between the two minority parties, the French and the Catholic, against the German majority of Protestant Radicals. In 1882 the federal assembly passed a bill es-

tablishing a Secretary of Education to watch over the execution of the constitutional clauses relating to schools; the referendum was demanded on it by 188,000 signatures, and at the general vote it was rejected by 316,000 votes against 175,000.

The constitution has not been revised as a whole since 1874, but several amendments have been made. These were proposed by the federal Assembly and voted by the people. Up to 1891 there were five so proposed and adopted: (1) To restore to the cantons the right of inflicting capital punishment (1879); (2) To permit the establishment of a federal monopoly in the manufacture and sale of alcohol, 1885; (3) To place copyright under federal control, 1887; (4) To give the federal government a monopoly of issuing paper currency, 1891; (5) Giving any 50,000 voters the right to propose amendments of the constitution, 1891.

The fifth of these amendments has worked a profound transformation by greatly increasing the direct control of the citizens over the government. It has led in practice to the establishment, under a disguise, of the popular initiative not only in constitutional but also in legislative changes. For, since no clear distinction is made between the constitution and ordinary laws, the demand of 50,000 citizens compels the government to submit to popular vote as a constitutional amendment, any measure whatsoever; and if the people adopt it, it goes into effect. Thus, in 1893, the popular initiative was used by the Anti-Semites to propose and carry a constitutional amendment forbidding the bleeding of animals in the manner practised in certain Jewish rites.* "When the Swiss democracy was induced to take this leap in the dark, nobody dreamed of the unlimited scope of this new popular right. The reputation of the Swiss for intelligence and democratic maturity . . . is going to be put to the rudest test" (Borgeaud).

Transformations of the Political Parties since 1848.—The decisive victory of the Radicals in 1848 set all the institutions of

* We are not without examples in this country of confusion between matters proper to the constitution and matters for ordinary legislative action. With us the mass of somewhat petty provisions in the newer State constitutions is primarily due to distrust of the legislative bodies—not to any theoretic hankerings for popular initiative. In Switzerland the original Federal Constitution of 1874 sets the example of descending to many trivial matters which have no proper place in a constitution: it is not to be wondered at that, with theories of popular initiative to be gratified, later amendments and the new cantonal constitutions should go farther afield in the same direction.—Tr.

Switzerland upon a course of democratic evolution which became very pronounced after the change of 1874 and which has already led to a direct government by the citizens. No civilized people has yet gone so far in this path. But this triumph of Radical policy has not resulted in giving the Radical leaders constant possession of power in all the cantons. Under the new institutions the old parties have succeeded in regaining control. In order to give themselves a fighting chance in the contest with the Radicals, they accepted the democratic constitutions voted by the people, without any attempt to return to the previous system. They attacked, not the principles, but the administration of the Radicals.

During the years of reaction following 1848 the Conservatives and Liberals regained power in several cantons (Berne, Bâle-city) and the Catholic party reconquered all the Catholic cantons. The Radical party ordinarily retained the majority in the federal bodies and in the Protestant cantons. But it maintained its hold only by vigilant resistance to the three opposing parties, sometimes in coalition. These contests at the elections for the possession of power, combined with the movement for direct government, have kept contemporary Switzerland in heated political excitement; but, except in the Italian canton of Ticino, agitation has always been kept within peaceful limits and carried on by methods accepted by all.

The history of these contests is further complicated by the coalitions and changes of party names. (At Geneva the old Conservatives became the Independents, and later the Democratic party.) I confine myself here to indicating the general development of the parties.

The Protestant Conservatives have become few in number and hardly count any more. In the Protestant cantons even the Church has been given a democratic organization; neither pastors nor communicants are held to a profession of faith; in several German cantons all the pastors are elected for a limited period. The political struggle in the Protestant cantons lay between the Liberals and Radicals; in those that are French the Radicals maintain their power, whereas in the German ones there has been an oscillation rather than a definite preponderance of either party.

The Catholic party has been reconstituted in all the Catholic districts, often under a democratic name. Its policy has been to gain a majority by appealing to Catholic sentiment and to

cantonal patriotism against the federal government controlled by the Protestants and the enemies of ecclesiasticism. The federal constitution of 1848 had abolished all that still remained of the old ecclesiastical *régime* in the cantons, suppressing all power of the clergy and all church taxes. But it did not impose a complete separation of Church and state; every canton retained its recognised churches; the government settled the relations with the Church and supervised the clergy. It also prescribed and supervised the work of the schools. On these two matters, Church and schools, the Catholic party made its contest.

It tried to get laws passed establishing liberty of the Church,—that is to say, abolishing State supervision of the clergy,—or, at the least, to get men elected who would not exercise the right of supervision. It tried to keep the primary schools under the control of the priests and to maintain in them Catholic teaching—also, perhaps, to prevent the rigorous application of the provision making education compulsory. The proportion of children going to school in the Protestant cantons (1 in 5) is in fact almost double that of the Catholic cantons (1 in 9). In the mixed cantons the proportion falls between these figures.

The Catholic party kept the power in the 7½ cantons that made the Sonderbund: all of these rejected the new Constitution of 1874. Of all the Catholic cantons Ticino is the only one in which the Liberal-Radical party has been able to dispute the possession of power with the Conservative Catholic party. In the mixed cantons the Catholic party is steadily in the minority and in dogged opposition to the government. These cantons are Geneva, Berne, Soleure, Thurgau, St. Gall, Bâle-country; Appenzell is divided into two half-cantons, the one Protestant and the other Catholic.

After the Vatican Council of 1870 the Catholic opposition took the form of an open conflict. The Old Catholics, rejecting the doctrine of Infallibility, separated themselves from the general body of those in communion with Rome. The Protestant governments of the cantons, holding the decrees of the Vatican Council to be null, recognised the Old Catholics as having the same rights as those who accepted the decrees, and undertook to maintain in the Church those Old Catholic priests who had been excommunicated by their bishop. In the canton of Geneva, belonging to the diocese of Freiburg, the quarrel connected itself with a previous conflict of powers. The Pope had instituted a vicar-

general for the canton in spite of the government. In St. Gall it took the form of a strife with the Jesuits.

The struggle began between the governments and the bishops. The bishop of Soleure was deprived and banished: the Pope, nearly all the priests, and the great majority of the Catholic laity protested. Then the question of sovereignty came to the front: Does the right to regulate the ecclesiastical organization belong to the Church or to the civil power? Some of the governments (Berne, Soleure, Aargau, Geneva) settled the question by getting the people to adopt a sort of civil constitution of the clergy which altered the territorial divisions without consulting the Pope, and established election of the priests by the laity. The Catholics called on the federal government to protect their religious liberty, but the federal government declared that the cantons had not exceeded their constitutional power. Then came a conflict between Switzerland and the Holy See. The Pope censured the cantons publicly; the federal government sent away the Pope's nuncio; the Catholics refused to vote in the election of priests (1873). The Old Catholics, organized into a "Catholic-Christian Church," became, as a result, the official Catholic Church. The conflict ended in a schism; in Bernese Jura troops were employed to put down Catholic outbreaks against the schismatic priests. The strife lasted till after the election of Leo XIII. in 1878.

The new generation which has assumed the direction of the Catholic party in these later years has dropped this contest regarding the powers of the state and the Church. A Catholic Democratic party has been formed which uses the referendum as a weapon against the centralizing measures of the Radicals. This party has even begun to demand social reforms. The Catholic Congress of 1894 voted to organize itself into a Catholic People's party; and it founded a free society of Swiss Sociologists composed of Catholics.

In the only Catholic canton in which the power of the Catholic party has been disputed (Ticino), the violent contests between the Catholic Conservatives and the Radical-Liberals led finally to a civil war, followed by the adoption of proportional representation—a change that may be the beginning of a new evolution in Swiss institutions. The two parties were about equal in numbers, but the Conservatives, in order to maintain their hold on power, had "gerrymandered" the electoral districts in such a way as to make sure of a majority of the representatives. They refused to submit to the people the question of changing the con-

stitution (1890). The Liberals rose in insurrection, ousted the Conservative office-holders, and established a provisional government. The federal authorities, compelled to intervene, induced the two parties to accept a new electoral system, long advocated by theoretical writers as a mode of protecting minorities. Instead of giving all the seats to the party having the majority in the district, the representation is shared between the parties in the proportion in which they share the popular vote. Proportional representation, adopted in Ticino in 1891, has later been introduced in Neuchâtel, Geneva, and Zug. Its champions are agitating for its adoption throughout Switzerland.

A Socialist agitation has also been developed since the change of constitution in 1874. Switzerland remains the asylum for political refugees; for the proscribed Germans of 1849, the proscribed French Republicans of 1851, the Italian exiles, the Russian Liberals and Revolutionists, the refugees of the Paris Commune, the German Socialists. In Switzerland the International has held nearly all its "congresses"; there the German Socialists, during the existence of the exceptional laws against them, resumed the publication of their suppressed journals and held their first "congress" (1880). The radical governments of the cantons and the federal government sustained the tradition, except against the demands of the German Empire. After protesting against the presence of the German spies (the Wohlgemuth case), the Federal Council so far yielded as to expel the editors of the Socialist journal. Their action was taken only against refugees suspected of plotting the use of explosives—the Russian Nihilists and the Anarchists.

But all these agitations were the work of foreigners; the Swiss themselves have held aloof from revolutionary societies. A league of workingmen, formed in 1873, was dissolved in 1880, for want of support. The "Swiss Social Democratic party," modelled after the German society, has hitherto received but few adherents.

The only group with socialistic tendencies which has had any influence on political life in Switzerland is the *Grütli Union*, a democratic society founded in 1838, composed chiefly of Swiss artisans, but little by little impregnated with Socialistic ideas, through contact with foreign Socialists. Controlling enough votes to set in motion the Federal referendum and initiative, the Union has demanded social reforms. It has carried through laws regarding inspection of factories and the liability of em-

ployers, and instituting a Secretary of Labour (the secretary has been a Socialist leader). It has even, in its official program, substituted the words *Social Democracy* for its old name Liberal Democracy; it has demanded for labourers legal protection against arbitrary dismissal by their employers, and a "Democratic organization of factory labour." It obtained in 1894 the submission to popular vote of a bill guaranteeing to every Swiss citizen "the right to an employment sufficiently remunerative"; the bill was rejected by 308,000 votes against 75,000.

BIBLIOGRAPHY.

BIBLIOGRAPHY.—See **Ch.-V. Langlois**, "Manuel de Bibliogr. Historique," 1896.

DOCUMENTS.—Collections of the parliamentary documents of the cantons may be found in detail in the Swiss bibliographies. The constitutional documents are gathered together in the official collection, "Sammlung der Bundesverfassung und der . . . 1880, in Kraft Bestehenden Kantonsverfassungen," 1880; the federal legislative documents in "Offizielle Sammlung der das Schweizerische Staatsrecht Betreffenden Aktenstücke . . . seit . . . 1848," 20 vols., 1849-87. See since 1890, "Annuaire Statistique de la Suisse" (published by the Bureau de Statistique).

For the narrative of political events, **Müller-Friedberg**, and **Escher**, "Schweizerische Annalen," since 1830; and since 1886, **K. Hilty**, "Politisches Jahrbuch der Schweizerischen Eidgenossenschaft," (1 vol. each year), perhaps the most scientific political annual in Europe.

The memoirs, recollections, and private papers form too numerous a group to be given in detail. See especially "Ludwig Snellis Leben und Wirken," 1858, a careful account of the origin of the Radical movement.

WORKS.—The modern political history of Switzerland is better known than that of any other European country, and more readily outlined in general works; it is enough to point out those works as they refer to the monographs and special histories of the cantons.

GENERAL HISTORY OF EVENTS: **Henne am Rhyn**, "Gesch. des Schweizervolkes . . .," vol. iii., 1878, by a radical patriot; a very passionate description of political struggles.—**Daendliker**, "Gesch. der Schweiz," new edit., vol. iii., 1895, liberal; a handy bibliogr., especially for economic hist.—**Vuillemin**, "Hist. de la Confédération Suisse" . . ., 2d edit., vol. ii., 1881.

HISTORIES OF DIFFERENT PERIODS: **Hilty**, "Oeffentliche Vorlesungen über die Helvetik," 1798 to 1803.—**Tillier**, "Gesch. der Eidgenossenschaft," 2 series, Restoration and period from 1830-48.—**Van Muyden**, "La Suisse sous le Pacte de 1815," 1890, a good account.—**Baumgartner**, "Die Schweiz und ihre Umgestaltungen, 1830-50," 1853-65.—**Feddersen**, "Gesch. der Schw. Regeneration," 1867.

HISTORIES OF THE SONDERBUND: **Dufour**, "Campagne du Sonderbund et Evénements de 1856," 1875. The author was general-in-chief of the fed-

eral army in the Sonderbund war.—**Cretineau-Joly**, "Hist. du Sonderbund," 2 vols., 1850.—**Esseiva**, "Fribourg, la Suisse et le Sonderbund," 1882; both written from the Catholic standpoint.

ON THE CATHOLIC PARTY: **Woeste**, "Hist. du Culturkampf en Suisse, 1871-86," 1887, by a Belgian Catholic.—**Keller**, "In Rei Memoriam," 1882, Catholic.—**Gareis and Zorn**, "Staat und Kirche in der Schweiz," 3 vols., 1877, treatise on relations between Church and state, by partisans of the sovereignty of the lay state.

ON THE SOCIALIST PARTIES: **Berghoff-Ising**, "Die Socialistische Arbeit-erbewegung in der Schweiz," 1895. The most complete and scientific account.

HISTORY OF INSTITUTIONS.—On the history of federal institutions, the excellent scientific manuals of **J. Meyer**, "Gesch. des Schweizerischen Bundesrechtes."—**Blumer**, translated into French, and revised by **Morel**, "Handbuch des Schweizerischen Bundesstaatsrechts," 3d edit., 1891-92.—**L. von Salis**, "Schw. Bundesrecht," 2 vols., 1891-92, trans. into French, gives an account of the practice of federal and administrative law since 1874.—**Hilty**, "Les Constitutions Fédérales de la Suisse," 1891, a very solid historical account.—**Orelli's** account in the Marquardsen collection is simply a popular work.—**Ch. Borgeaud**, "Établissement et Revision des Constitutions," 1893, gives a very intelligent view of the evolution of federal constitutional law.

On the history of the *referendum* and *initiative*, **Curti**, "Gesch. der Schw. Volksgesetzgebung," 2d edit., 1885. Very instructive.—**Stussi**, "Referendum und Initiative in den Schw. Kantonen," 1894.—**A. Keller**, "Das Volksinitiativrecht nach den Schw. Kantonsverfassungen," 1889.

The descriptions of Switzerland by foreigners (**H. Dixon**, **Tissot**, **Adams and Cunningham**, **Winchester**) are in no way superior to the works of Swiss authors. The best account of Swiss institutions in English is found in **A. L. Lowell's** "Parties and Governments in Continental Europe," vol. ii.

CHAPTER X.

SPAIN AND PORTUGAL.

THE Iberian peninsula, in the eighteenth century, was still divided between two states: the great Kingdom of Spain and the little Kingdom of Portugal. Both kingdoms were governed by the same general methods. Each had an absolute King who let his favourites rule without restraint; each had a National Church, which owned great estates, and was armed with the Inquisition against heretics. In both, the Church had a censorship over all publications and the right of supervision over all the schools. Both suffered in the nineteenth century the same series of revolutions; both were at length organized into constitutional monarchies. The two evolutions are parallel, so that we might consider their history together. It will, however, be more clear if we examine separately first Spain, then Portugal.

SPAIN.

Spain at the End of the Napoleonic Wars.—Spain until the French invasion was an absolutist and ecclesiastical monarchy. The former little kingdoms, united to form the Spanish monarchy, still existed in name (Castile, Leon, Galicia, Asturia, Navarre, Aragon, Valencia, and the kingdoms of Andalusia), but they were nothing more than provinces ruled directly by the Castilian government. The old assemblies of estates (the Cortes) were no longer convoked. The descendants of the aristocracy, the Spanish *grandees*, had been thrust aside. There remained but one political power, the King.

The King had centralized all authority in his own person, but he had ceased to exercise it himself; he left it to his court. It was neither the old *Castilian Council* nor his ministerial cabinet that governed in his stead. It was the sovereign's immediate circle, his wife, his confessor, his favourite, or his wife's favourite, that governed Spain in the King's name. This little group was called the *camarilla* or little chamber. Thus during the reign of Charles IV. the real sovereign was the Queen's favourite, Godoy, created Prince of Peace.

The Church alone preserved the privileges and powers of former times. It retained its immense domains almost without taxes, its right to acquire property by *mortmain*, its convents, and its ecclesiastical courts. It kept up the court of the Inquisition and its control of family relations, which gave it authority over the private life of all laymen. Its censorship of all publications made it supreme over the nation's intellectual life.

There were thus in Spain but two real powers, the *camarilla* and the clergy. The Spanish submitted to this twofold despotism without thought of saving themselves from it, at least without the power to do so. The idea and the means of reforming their government came from outside. In Spain, as in Holland and Switzerland, an invasion began the work of regeneration.

The French invasion, by destroying the old Spanish system, compelled the Spaniards to try a new one; it was the decisive event in their history. Napoleon, by setting up in Madrid a French King, placed before Spain the alternative of accepting or fighting him. Those who rallied to the French King's support, the *afrancesados*, made acquaintance with an absolutist and military government, but one directed by regular officials and free from the power of the clergy. The patriots, rising against foreign dominion, continued to declare themselves subjects of the national King, "Ferdinand the Idolized"; but as their King was imprisoned in France, they had to fight and govern themselves without him. The old system was gone with the Bourbon King; there was no longer a *camarilla* nor an Inquisition nor a censorship. In place of the lost government the patriots organized another, while at the same time they improvised militia and *guerrillas*.

The movement came from the provinces farthest from the court, Asturia, Aragon, Catalonia, Valencia, and Andalusia. The provinces began once more to take a part in political life. They formed at first provincial *juntas*, then a central *junta*, and finally the Cortes of 1811. These improvised governments and armies brought into public life energetic men who were previously unknown. The English of Wellington's army were astonished at the opening of the Cortes; they had not thought it possible that Spain could produce so many brilliant men. Thus during the invasion a body of politicians and military officers was created to take the direction of affairs. These men, educated like all Spaniards, had no political knowledge; but as reading and

speech were now unrestricted, they learned the existence of things that had been hidden from them before. They read foreign books, talked with French and English officers, studied the French Revolution and the English parliamentary system. From this improvised instruction resulted the Constitution of 1812, which was the first form given in Spain to modern political ideas.

The Constitution of 1812 can only be explained by the special conditions under which it was produced. The Cortes, suddenly summoned under the pressure of the people of Cadiz, had nothing but the name in common with the historical Cortes of *grandees* and *prelates*. It was an assembly elected by a sort of universal suffrage in three degrees. The Castilian provinces, which were occupied by the French armies, did not send deputies. The majority was composed of deputies from the maritime provinces, Catalonia, Galicia, and Cadiz, which were more democratic and less attached to absolutism than the rest of Spain. The Cortes thus had an exceptionally democratic character. It resembled the French States-General of '89, adopted the same doctrines, and like them deliberated in the midst of clamour and applause from the public in the galleries, and voted the same measures.

The Assembly was divided into two parties: the *Serviles*, attached to the old *régime*, and the *Liberals*, partisans of liberty. It was from Spain that the latter term came into popular usage. The *Liberales*, who were in majority, declared the Cortes sovereign and indissoluble (like the French *Constituante* in '89) and voted to abolish the old system, with its censorship of the press, seigniorial rights, patrimonial jurisdictions, and privileges of the nobility.

The Constitution of 1812 was drawn up in the same spirit. After a preamble in honour of the "old fundamental laws of this monarchy," the Cortes proclaimed the very principle of the French Revolution: "Sovereignty is vested essentially in the nation, accordingly it is to the nation exclusively that the right of making its fundamental laws belongs." The end of the sentence, "and of accepting the form of government which suits it best," was rejected by 87 votes against 73. The government was organized on the model of the French Constitution of 1791. The executive power was given to the King to be exercised through his ministers. The legislative power was given to the Cortes subject to royal assent, which could be twice withheld. Ministers

could not be deputies and had access to the Cortes only when sent for. The Cortes was composed of a single assembly, elected by indirect universal suffrage. The deputies were elected for two years only and were not eligible for re-election. The constitution established rules for the organization of courts, provincial administration, taxation, the army, and public education. It proclaimed the principles of liberty and legal equality. This was the abolition of the old *régime* root and branch.

On one point the Liberals did not dare break with tradition: they did not announce religious liberty. "The religion of the Spanish nation is and always will be the Apostolic Church of Rome, the only true Church; the nation protects it by wise and just laws and forbids the exercise of any other religion." At least the Cortes refused to restore the Inquisition that the French had abolished, in spite of the demands made by the monks who filled the galleries.

Thus the national insurrection of 1808 in favour of the absolute King against the French invaders had ended by creating a Liberal party and a revolutionary constitution, like those of France.

Restoration of 1814.—The attempt at a liberal government by the Cortes of 1811 was suddenly brought to an end. French intervention had caused the downfall of the old system, English intervention brought about the Restoration.

The English army brought back the absolute King. The King's absence in itself had been an advantage to the Liberals. After his return the balance of parties shifted. The *Serviles* presented to Ferdinand a manifesto against the Cortes and the constitution, which they said was a copy of the constitution proposed by Napoleon at Bayonne; they asked him to convoke the Cortes according to the ancient custom. As the King passed through the country the monks and the people saluted him with cries of "Long live the absolute King! Down with the traitors!" Ferdinand joined the absolutists; he signed the manifesto: "My royal will is not only not to swear obedience to the constitution and not to accept any decree from the Cortes, but to declare this constitution and these decrees void. . . Whoever should maintain them . . . would commit an outrage against the prerogatives of my sovereignty and the welfare of the nation. . . I declare him guilty of high treason; he shall suffer the penalty of death; if he sustain these acts by tongue or pen." Orders were given to close the hall of the Cortes and to seize their records.

Thirty-three notables of the Liberal party were then arrested. The court could find no complaint against them; they were left in prison for a year and a half. Finally, in December, 1815, the King himself, sitting in judgment without having read the papers in their cases, condemned some of them to eight years in a convict prison (*presidio*), others to imprisonment in a convent, others to exile, adding that at the expiration of their sentence they would still remain at the King's discretion. The members of the tribunal of Valencia were dismissed from their judgeships for having had a medal struck with the inscription "The King and the Constitution."

The old system was restored, as before 1808, with the Castilian Council, privileges, Inquisition, and *camarilla*. Every evening, it is said, the King's confessors met with him, drafted decrees, and ordered arrests.

But the government did not find the same condition of affairs as before the invasion. 1st, Five years of war had destroyed the cities, villages, roads, and bridges, decimated and impoverished the population. The government resources were diminished and its burdens increased. In 1816 the expenses were estimated at 1,051,000,000 *reals* (about \$13,000,000) and the receipts at little more than half that amount. The financial system must be reformed to cover this deficit. 2d, The American colonies, revolting against the French usurpers, had remained in revolt against the legitimate King; armies must be sent to subdue them.

The restoration government came to grief in these two enterprises. Ferdinand at first let his minister Garay prepare a budget project for 1817, reducing expenses and exacting a contribution from the clergy and high officials. He even supported Garay against the clergy and the court until September, 1817, then suddenly dismissed him before any reform had been realized. In the American war Ferdinand had counted on assistance from Tsar Alexander; he also remained for a number of years under the influence of the Russian ambassador, who used his power to keep Garay in office and to secure the financial reform. Finally, in February, 1818, the Russian fleet sent to aid the king in subduing his colonies arrived at Cadiz, but it was composed of old unseaworthy ships; the King had to send them back to Russia and pay the expenses of their return. In 1820 the army which had been prepared in 1816 against Buenos Ayres was still waiting to embark.

Revolution of 1820.—The war against Napoleon had roused a

new power in Spain, the officers of the army. These had led the nation in revolt, and they remained the real representatives of the nation in opposition to the court. They were acquainted with one another, kept in communication from one end of Spain to the other, and were able to take concerted action against the government.

Many of them, connected with Masonic lodges organized by the French and English during the invasion time, had meetings with the liberal Free Masons. It was the officers, aided perhaps by the Free Masons, who started the revolution in the name of the Constitution of 1812. A military revolt attempted in 1815 had failed. But the army was not satisfied. Ferdinand had no love for the army, and held aloof from the officers wherever he could; the soldiers received neither clothes, food, nor money.

In 1820 the revolt began in the south, in the army encamped near Cadiz, waiting since 1816 to leave for America. This *pronunciamiento* did not succeed. Riego crossed the whole province of Andalusia with 1500 men without meeting either opposition or support. His example did, however, produce a decisive uprising in the north. Santiago, the old ecclesiastical city of Galicia, had a rival, Corunna, the commercial seaport, where a group of Liberals was still in existence. These made arrangements with the officers of the garrison and formed an insurrectional *junta*, which proclaimed the Constitution of 1812. The other army corps refused to fight or else declared themselves in sympathy with the insurgents. The King was alarmed and announced his readiness to accept the constitution.

Thus, from this first revolution on, provincial *juntas* and military *pronunciamientos* were the active agencies of insurrection. First created to oppose the foreign invader, these two instruments were to serve henceforth to excite political revolutions. They corresponded to the two elements in which Spanish political life was concentrated, the army and the city populations, especially in the outlying provinces, Galicia, Aragon, Catalonia, Valencia, Mercia, and Andalusia. The *junta* furnished the impulse to revolt, the army supplied the power and controlled the movement.

The generals, who in old Spain were of no importance, became veritable sovereigns of new Spain. The country entered upon a *régime* of *pronunciamientos*; a superior officer revolted against the government, issuing a proclamation to explain his conduct and appeal to the discontented. If the government was no longer sufficiently popular to be defended by the army, the insurgents

overturned it and set up another. This appeal to force, irregular though it might be, was, in a country not yet provided with political education, the sole check on the despotism of the court.

From the time of this first revolution parties began to form and questions to arise. The absolutist party was shut out of the government. The Liberal party organized itself. It was at first directed at Madrid by a political club, "the National and Constitutional Patriotic Society of the Lorencini Café," which held public meetings and published the *Aurora de España*. In the great cities of the provinces provisional *juntas* assumed the administration in place of the officials; some of them even suppressed or established taxes. The Liberal party held the King in its power and governed in his name, invoking the constitution. The text of the constitution was posted in each city, and carried in processions like the Eucharist and treated with the same honours. The King swore solemnly to observe the constitution and signed a decree "that every Spaniard who will not swear allegiance to the constitution or who does it with protest and reservation is unworthy of being considered a Spaniard, instantly loses his honour, his employment, and advantages conferred by the state, and must be driven out of the monarchy." The bishops received the order to have the constitution expounded by the parish priests. The Cortes was then elected according to the constitution. As early as this first election a fact appeared which has been repeated in every subsequent Spanish election of the century: the great majority of those elected were supporters of the government.

In the Cortes of 1820 the Liberals divided into two parties: the *Moderados* (moderates), who supported the ministry and wished to avoid conflict with the King and clergy; the *Exaltados* (fanatics), who wished to provoke conflict. The *Moderados* had a great majority in the Cortes, while the *Exaltados* were supported almost entirely at first by the turbulent cities of Andalusia and, in Madrid, by the *Fontana de Oro* club. The ministers obtained from the Cortes laws limiting the liberty of the press and forbidding political societies. But the *Moderados* could not keep up their policy of conciliation with the King and clergy. The king did not accept the constitution sincerely, and it could not be modified, for the Cortes of 1812, in order to prevent the return to absolutism, had established a process for revision which required several years. The clergy was opposed to the liberal system in advance. The finances were in a desperate state, with a

deficit increasing yearly, for the Cortes had lowered the unpopular land tax, and the taxes came in slowly. The debt was estimated at 700,000,000 dollars. The ministry decided to appropriate the church estates by a law suppressing the monasteries. The clergy became henceforth the irreconcilable enemy of the *Moderados*.

The *Moderados*' opponents, absolutists and *Exaltados*, worked together. The King's confessor secretly excited the *Exaltados* against the ministry. In opposition to the leaders of the *Moderados* the Free Masons formed a new secret society, the *Communeros*, whose members had to swear "to defend the rights and liberties of the human race and especially the Spanish people." The members were chiefly young men and petty military officers.

The *Moderados* kept themselves in power with difficulty, surrounded by *Exaltado* insurrections and *Servile* intrigues, for two years, until the end of the Cortes. But at the renewal for 1822, as the constitution forbade the re-election of any retiring deputy, the leaders of the *Moderados* found themselves shut out, and the elections, conducted in great disorder, gave the majority to the *Exaltados*. The King again formed a *Moderado* ministry; but he conspired against his ministry himself. Bands of absolutists, formed by smugglers and peasants, led by monks, made their appearance in the mountains of Catalonia. The royal guard revolted, dismissed its liberal officers, and fought against the army in Madrid, on July 7, 1822.

A new ministry composed of *Exaltados* was imposed on the king by the majority in the Cortes; it was supported by the *Communeros* and the people in the cities of Andalusia, Valencia, Aragon, and Catalonia. But when the absolutists revolted against the Cortes and set up a *junta* in Catalonia which called the nation to arm and deliver their imprisoned King from the rebels, they declared null all the government's acts since 1820 and established a regency. These insurgents called themselves "the apostolic army" and posed as the defenders of religion against the Free Mason constitutionalists (the *Blacks*).

Restoration of 1823.—The absolutist party was too feeble to reconquer Spain. The restoration was brought about by foreign intervention. The governments of the four great continental monarchies of Europe had been from the beginning unfriendly to the revolution of 1820; but they dared not risk an invasion of Spain. The French government finally took the responsibility of it. The French army invaded Spain this time to restore the

absolute monarchy. The guerrillas of the northern frontiers, who in the time of Napoleon had fought against the French, now formed the "army of the faith" and marched with the invaders.

The Spanish government had neither army nor money, and made no attempt to stop the French. The Cortes withdrew first to Seville, then to Cadiz, taking with them the unwilling King. Ferdinand said he was sick; they replied that a change of air would cure him. On the departure for Cadiz, he refused to go; the Cortes, not wishing to depose the King, declared him insane and established a regency. The absolutists, entering Madrid with the French army, formed a regency which restored the conditions of 1820. All over the country bands of *Royal Volunteers* were organized, and the bishop of Osma even founded a secret absolutist society, the *Destroying Angel*. Notable Liberals were imprisoned and held to ransom and their houses pillaged.

The government of the Cortes at Cadiz capitulated at the end of three months. After the fall of the Trocadero, Ferdinand was sent to the French camp; on his departure he promised to grant an amnesty, "general, full, and complete." The next day Ferdinand published a manifesto annulling all the acts of the "so-called constitutional government" and ratifying all the acts of the absolutist *junta* and regency. He then condemned to the gallows the three members of the liberal regency.

Ferdinand, reinstated as an absolute monarch, chose his confessor for his prime minister. He dared not restore the Inquisition, but he tried to replace it with "*juntas* of the faith." This meant the restoration of the old *régime*. But three permanent results followed from the revolution:

1. The American colonies had taken advantage of the confusion in the mother country to effect a final separation.
2. The debt and the deficit had increased.
3. The absolutists and the king had acquired against the Liberals a hatred which found vent in years of persecution. No one who had filled an office or served in the national guard during the constitutional *régime* could come within 15 miles of the royal residence. The Liberal leaders were arrested; Riego was hanged. Purge-commissions were established, before which every office-holder and army officer must appear and prove that during the constitutional period he had committed no offence against the crown or the Church. To encourage men to become king's evidence the government promised them both secrecy and a pardon.

The inquiry was extended to the professors and students, and finally to the common soldiers.

This rigorous system was beginning to relax when, in 1824, the Liberal refugees in Gibraltar attempted an insurrection, and the persecution was resumed. One hundred and twelve accused persons were hanged or shot. Seven Free Masons were executed for holding a meeting. Every man was prosecuted in whose possession was found any book printed in Spain between 1820 and 1823, or a foreign book. In the universities the students had to swear not to recognise the sovereignty of the people or to join a secret society.

Until Ferdinand's death, in 1833, the government was controlled by court intrigues or the influence of foreign ambassadors. The ministers were all Absolutists, but they did not all have the same policy. The majority (Ufalia from 1823, Zea in 1825, Burgos in 1827) wished to restore peace in the nation by granting amnesty to the Liberals and putting the Royal Volunteers under government control. The Apostolic party was dissatisfied and deserted Ferdinand for his brother Carlos, who was known to be devoted to the clergy. There were even royalist insurrections in Catalonia against the King, in 1824, 1825, and particularly in 1827. The insurgents demanded the dissolution of the army, the abolition of new institutions of which the nation knew nothing, "such as police and public education," and the meeting of a national council to settle the true principles of religion. But Carlos refused to lift a hand against the legitimate sovereign.

The result was to alienate Ferdinand from his own supporters. He let the ministers make a timid attempt at financial reform. But, in 1831, an attack by the Liberal refugees in France caused him to revert to the system of terror. Courts-martial were established. A young man was hanged in Madrid for crying "Hurrah for liberty!" and a young widow at Granada for embroidering a flag with the inscription: "Law, Liberty, Equality."

War of the Succession (1830-33).—The absolutist system came to an end in the quarrel regarding the law of succession. By his first three wives Ferdinand had no children, so that his brother Carlos must be his heir. His fourth wife was a Neapolitan princess, Christina, who bore him two daughters. Since the accession of the Bourbons at the beginning of the eighteenth century, the succession had been, in Spain as in France, through the male line exclusively; Carlos was therefore the legitimate heir. But in 1831 Ferdinand, wishing to secure the succession to his

own daughter, availed himself of a decree restoring the old order of female succession, which had been prepared in 1789 but had never been promulgated; he now promulgated it without notifying either his brother or the Council of State.

From this time, April 3, 1830, until Ferdinand's death, Spain's whole policy depended on the struggle between two influences, that of the Queen and that of the Apostolic party. The Queen ruled at first, supported the ministers in office, had Louis Philippe recognised, and, when a daughter was born to her, sought to gain support among the ancient aristocracy so long excluded from the court, by appointing chamberlains and maids of honour. The attempt of the Liberals in 1831 threw the King on the side of the Apostolic party for eighteen months; in September, 1832, when he was thought to be dying, the Queen in her isolation was obliged to consent to a measure annulling the decree of 1831 restoring female succession. But Ferdinand recovered, dismissed his ministers, and placed the government in the Queen's hands. A royal act annulled the measure obtained during the King's illness. In June, 1833, the Castilian Cortes were convoked in the old form,—the *grandees* and the *proctors* of 38 cities,—and were made to swear to recognise the King's daughter Isabella as Queen. But the new order of succession was still much debated. The King had his brother asked to take the oath. Carlos replied by begging him to communicate his protest to the sovereigns: "I am firmly convinced of my legitimate right to the throne of Spain in case I should survive Your Majesty and you should leave no son; I declare that neither my conscience nor my honour will permit me to swear to recognise any other claims."

Carlos was supported by all the monks, the greater part of the clergy, many army officers, all the Royal Volunteers (officially estimated at 10,000 foot-soldiers and 4000 cavalry, armed and uniformed), all the cities of Castile, and all the Pyrenean provinces. The Queen's party included only the office-holders, *grandees*, and a part of the army; but it had the decided advantage of being in possession of the government at the time of the King's sudden death, September 29, 1833. The Queen was appointed regent until the majority of her daughter, Queen Isabella.

The minister who governed in Christina's name, Zea Bermudez, aspired to maintain the absolutist system and govern in opposition to both the Carlists and the Liberals. In 1832

he had declared the Queen "irreconcilably opposed to any religious or political innovation"; and after Isabella's accession, he had her say: "I will maintain the forms and fundamental laws of the monarchy without admitting dangerous innovations." But Christina finally realized that to resist the Carlists she needed the help of all opponents of the old *régime*, and she decided to seek the support of the Liberals. She granted amnesty for political offences, and ordered the Royal Volunteers to disarm; the Liberals then gave her open support. Spain was then arrayed in two parties: *Carlists* and *Christinos*. The European states also took sides; the constitutional governments, England and France, with Christina, the absolute monarchies with Carlos.

The Statute of 1834 and the Constitution of 1837.—The government first attempted administrative reforms; Spain was divided into 49 provinces, each with a civil governor, after the model of the French departments. These still remain the divisions of Spain, and have definitely replaced the former historic provinces. Then, in order to be able to make war on the Carlists, the queen called on the Liberals to take the government.

The ministry, under a Liberal martyr, Martinez de la Rosa, decided to grant a new constitution. But the framers of it affected to avoid the forms of 1812. The Queen Regent promulgated a Royal Statute in her daughter's name, announcing that she had "resolved to convoke the general Cortes of the kingdom." These Cortes should hold public sessions and should have the power to vote taxes and laws. But the ministers were not to be responsible to the Cortes; the government reserved the right to convoke and dissolve the Cortes, to appoint its presiding officers, and to propose bills for enactment. The Cortes was divided into two estates (*estamentos*). That of the *Proceres* was composed of prelates, hereditary *grandees* enjoying an income of \$10,000 and life-members appointed by the crown with an income qualification of \$3000. The *Procuradores*, who formed the second estate, were deputies elected for three years by indirect election—the primary voters being property owners. Deputies-elect must have an income of \$600, and were to receive no salary.

Under old Spanish names this was almost the same as the French Charter under Louis XVIII. Spain became, by concession from the crown, a constitutional monarchy. It had not yet, however, a true representative system; the ministry was still independent of the nation's representatives. Even if it should

become responsible to the Chamber, it would be so only in name. If the ministers found themselves in conflict with the Cortes, they had only to dissolve it in order to be sure of a victory, for the government in Spain has an irresistible influence over the electors. There have been many elections since 1835, and they have always given the government a majority. The elective chamber was in 1844, and is still, hardly more than an ornament. And yet the Statute of 1834 marks a new era in the political life of Spain; henceforth the ministers, whether generals or politicians, exercise the power, and the ministry has taken the place of the *camarilla*.

With the opening of the Cortes in 1834 began a greatly agitated parliamentary life. The Liberals who returned from exile brought with them the doctrines and formulas of liberal countries—France and England. A new generation of orators appeared with the Spanish gift of eloquence. But their debates in the Cortes have more literary than political interest. The possession of power rested mainly on military revolts, court intrigues, and the influence of the foreign governments that formed the Quadruple Alliance. All these counterbalancing forces produced a very unstable equilibrium. The ministries were short; in twenty-five years, 1833 to 1858, there were 47 presidents of the council, 61 ministers of the interior, 78 of finance, and 96 of war. As the deputies received no salary, politicians had no alternative but to become ministers or office-holders. So the contention for possession of the ministry has been fierce. In this impoverished country, where opportunities to make a living are scant, there have always been many more candidates than offices to be filled. This competition between candidates for office is the ruling force and explains the parliamentary disturbances in Spain. Personal motives are, however, disguised under the name of efforts for the success of a party.

The Liberals, as after 1820, divided into two parties: *Moderates* and *Progressists*. The latter name took the place of *Exaltados*.

The Moderates accepted the Royal Statute, that is to say, the sovereign's control over the Chambers. They wished to keep the upper house exclusively for hereditary and life members, to have high voting qualifications, and a censorship of the press. They were willing to leave the local administrations—the municipalities and the provincial deputations—subject to the central government. They wished to avoid radical reforms, which the clergy and great landowners disapproved, and confine themselves

to administrative and financial reforms. They were supported by the French government. Their party was an aristocratic one, formed by officials and such of the great landowners as were not Carlists; its power lay in the central and northern provinces.

The Progressists demanded the Constitution of 1812, which made the Cortes superior to the government. They wanted more democratic elections, liberty of the press and of creed, and elective local authorities in the provinces and cities. They declared themselves opposed to the clergy and aristocracy. They looked to the English government for support. They were a democratic and provincial party, particularly numerous in Andalusia and in the cities of ancient Aragon—Barcelona, Saragossa, and Valencia.

The Moderates, called to the ministry by the Queen Regent, had to direct the war against the Carlists. Despairing of bringing it to an end, they twice asked help from France, and were twice refused. The Progressists, irritated by the Carlist victories, had risen against the monks; at Saragossa the people sacked the monasteries and massacred a number of monks; at Barcelona they burned six monasteries, shot 32 monks, and beat others to death; at Madrid four monasteries were burned. Insurrectional *juntas* proclaimed the Constitution of 1812, attacked officials, and levied taxes. In September, 1835, the Queen, on the advice of the English ambassador, called to the ministry a Jewish banker, Mendizabal, who was friendly to the Progressists and connected in business affairs with London. The new minister gave promise of relieving Spain's financial embarrassment.

The budget had never ceased to show a deficit; since 1823 over \$150,000,000 had been borrowed. Mendizabal was counting on the monastic possessions to pay off the debt; they were valued at \$900,000,000. There were 90,000 monks. In 1836, by a series of decrees, he suppressed all the monasteries, congregations, and other religious houses for men, also some of the convents for women. He declared their real and personal property appropriated to paying off the national debt. The government gained almost nothing from this transaction: government paper, instead of going up, went down from 16 to 12.

The Queen took a Moderate ministry again in 1836, and new elections gave it a majority in the Cortes. But the Progressists revolted in Andalusia, Aragon, Catalonia, and Madrid. Queen Christina was with Muñoz, her favourite, at her country-seat, Granja Castle. One evening, August 12, 1836, while the supe-

rior officers were at the theatre, the lower officers led the garrison in revolt, invaded the castle, and forced the Queen to promulgate the Constitution of 1812, then to summon a Progressist ministry. The Progressists assumed power, and decided to revise the Constitution of 1812 without conforming to the prescribed forms of revision, and had the Cortes vote the constitution of June, 1837. This was a compromise between the Constitution of 1812 and the Statute of 1834. It gave to the Cortes the initiative in making laws, to the King the right to refuse his assent and to dissolve the Cortes. The Cortes was to consist of two houses: the *Senate*, composed of members appointed for life by the crown from a list prepared by the electors; the *Congress*, composed of deputies elected by direct vote for 3 years. They were made re-eligible, contrary to the system of 1812. The ministers might be taken from among the members of the Cortes. The article on religion was purposely voted in very vague form: "The nation promises to maintain the creed and ministers of the Catholic religion which the Spaniards profess." They avoided deciding between the principle of religious intolerance admitted in 1812 and the principle of toleration demanded by the Progressists. Local and provincial administration was to be left to elective authorities.

This system was not allowed time to work itself out in practice. But there were henceforth in Spain two constitutions, corresponding to the two parties: the Statute of 1834 for the Moderates, the Constitution of 1837 for the Progressists.

The Carlist War (1834-39).—During all these political struggles between the two factions of the Liberal party civil war was still going on between the government armies, the *Christinos*, and the absolutist insurgents, the *Carlists*. Don Carlos had taken no steps to organize his supporters. In all the provinces except Andalusia, armed bands proclaimed Charles V., but were soon dispersed (1834). Carlos was in Portugal, with the absolutist pretender, Miguel, hoping to return to Spain with a Portuguese army. It was, however, a Spanish army that invaded Portugal and forced the two pretenders to set sail for England.

The Carlists' power lay in the fact that their party was not composed entirely of absolutists and clergy: it included also the mountaineers of Navarre and the Basque country. The three Basque provinces were not incorporated in the Spanish monarchy; the king was only *lord* there, with neither army nor officials. The Basques governed themselves, each province hav-

ing its *señoría*, each village its assembly of the heads of families. They paid no royal taxes, rendered no military service. The country was outside the line of Spanish customs duties, which gave the inhabitants the double advantage of trading freely with France on one side and of plying the trade of smuggling goods into Spain on the other side. This is the combination of liberties known as the *fueros*. Navarre enjoyed similar privileges. The Basque country did not suffer the poverty of Spain. It had none of the beggars and ruined villages (*despoblados*) seen in the other provinces. The valleys were well cultivated and the houses well kept up. There were many schools and few convents. The society was democratic, composed of peasant landowners, and very Catholic, rendering faithful obedience to native priests.

To these peoples the old *régime* signified the maintenance of the *fueros*. Liberal victory meant centralization, uniform laws, the prospect of descending to a level with Spain. By taking up arms for the absolute king the mountaineers thus defended their privileged position; also their religion, which they believed to be threatened by the Liberals.

Zumalacarregrui, a Basque, and a colonel in the regular army, organized the first Carlist army in Navarre. The insurgents of the Basque provinces then put themselves under his command. Each province formed its battalions; the men, clothed in the native costume of wool, with Tam o' Shanter caps, linen shoes on their feet, carrying only a woollen blanket and a linen sack, could pass through the most difficult mountain paths; they made marches of 16 to 18 hours. The Carlist methods were the same as those of the *guerillas*; to avoid battles, and take the enemy by surprise, retreating before superior forces over the mountain to another valley. They were sure of help from the inhabitants everywhere. The Christinos were heavily encumbered and could use only the valley roads, among a hostile population which refused to guide them and reported their movements to the Carlists. The army, formed partially of new recruits, ill-equipped and often left unpaid by the government, exhausted itself in fruitless manœuvres.

This war of all Spain against the mountaineers lasted over five years. It consisted of numberless, confused, and insignificant operations, conducted separately in two regions: in the west, Navarre and the Basque provinces; in the east, Catalonia and Aragon. In all these countries the cities, guarded by national guards composed of Liberals, remained faithful to the govern-

ment and resisted the attacks of the Carlists. Don Carlos returned from England in July, 1834, and established his court and government in Navarre.

The war very soon became fierce. The Carlists murdered their prisoners: they could not guard or feed them. The government generals had the insurgent officers and soldiers shot. Notables of the opposing party were shot on both sides, and both began to take hostages and execute them. In Catalonia, where the Carlist general Cabrera had had an alcade shot, General Mina, one of the heroes of the Liberal party, had Cabrera's mother, an inoffensive old lady, arrested and shot, "to restrain," he said, "by a just system of reprisals the excesses of the blood-thirsty Cabrera."

Both parties received outside aid. The constitutional governments lent the Spanish government an English legion and a French legion: the absolutist governments and the French legitimists sent Carlos money, arms, and volunteers.

The Carlists seemed many times to be on the point of victory; but Don Carlos either could not or would not profit by these occasions. He was neither a general nor a statesman; he counted on miraculous help from the Mother of Grief,—whom he appointed head of the royal armies in 1836,—and let himself be directed by his *camarilla* of confessors and favourites, who thwarted the operations of his generals. Three times he failed to conquer:

1. In 1835, during the struggles between the Moderates and Progressists, Zumalacarrequi was preparing to march on Madrid with 28,000 men; the *camarilla* sent him to besiege Bilbao, and he was killed.

2. In 1836, after the *Granja pronunciamiento*, the Moderates seemed ready, out of hatred to the Progressists, to join Don Carlos; but, instead of promising an amnesty, he ordered public prayers for the extermination of unbelievers.

3. In 1837 Don Carlos finally decided to march on Castile, but he could take only 12,000 foot soldiers and 1200 cavalry, unprovided with food or money, and let himself be turned aside toward Valencia. At the end of four months he came in sight of Madrid, but, not daring to attack it, retired to the mountains without a battle.

Don Carlos' supporters divided at length into two parties: on the one hand, the *Apostolicals*, the king's ministers and confessors; and, on the other, the *Marotists*, partisans of General-in-

chief Maroto,—the army and the mountaineers. Maroto finally arrested and shot four generals of the Apostolic party; Don Carlos declared him a traitor. Maroto at the head of his army forced Don Carlos to dismiss his councillors and declare his approval of the steps taken by his general.

The Basques were weary of war. A party had been formed in 1837, with the motto *Paz y fueros*, peace and the *fueros*. It was ready to accept Queen Isabella on condition that the country should retain its privileges. The Liberal government authorized its general, Espartero, to make terms with the insurgents on this basis. The negotiations, interrupted but resumed again, brought about the Convention of Vergara, August 31, 1839. The Carlist army was disarmed; each man was given the choice of retiring or passing into the service of the government with his grade and his decorations. Espartero was to advise the government to promise to recommend to the Cortes the guarantee of the *fueros*. Don Carlos fled to France with 8000 men. Cabrera continued the war in Catalonia until July, 1840.

The Military Dictatorship of Espartero and of Narvaez (1840-51).—As soon as the Carlist war was over, the generals became the political leaders of Spain; they bore the name of a party, but in reality they struggled against one another for the mastery of the power.

Espartero, created Duke of Vittoria, famed for having put an end to the Carlist war, was the first military dictator. He disliked Queen Christina, who favoured the Moderates, and so he sided with the Progressists. The occasion of his revolt was the municipal law of 1840, passed by the Moderates, who were then in power; it took from the municipalities the right of electing the *alcaldes*, and gave the power of appointment to the government, contrary to the Constitution of 1837. The Progressists revolted in Barcelona, then in Madrid; Espartero supported them. Christina, deserted by the army, fled to France (1840). Espartero got himself named as regent. For three years he governed Spain. He defeated the Moderate generals, who revolted at Pampeluna in 1840. He bombarded Barcelona, where a Republican party had formed, and, with the aid of the officers, had proclaimed a republic. After having dissolved the Cortes twice in five months, he was defeated by a coalition of all the parties, Moderates, Progressists, and Republicans, and was forced to leave Spain. Queen Isabella was declared of age in 1843.

The coalition was short-lived. The Moderates, backed by the

generals, overturned the Progressist ministry and recalled Queen Christina, who married Muñoz and created him Duke of Rianzares. One of the Moderate generals, Narvaez, assumed control of the government in May, 1844, and governed, with a few interruptions, until 1851. The Progressist constitution of 1837 was set aside to make room for the Constitution of 1845, almost a reproduction of the Statute of 1834. The crown, the ministry, and a Council of State exercised all the real power, and appointed the municipal and provincial authorities. It was a centralized system copied from France. Newspapers were closely watched, and no article could be printed without previous approval of the government.

As a means of conciliation the clergy received back the possessions that had not been sold. Under the Moderates' rule the question of the Spanish marriages, which had for so long filled the French and English newspapers, was at length brought to an end. These marriages—that of Queen Isabella with her cousin Francis, Duke of Cadiz, and that of Luisa, the Queen's sister, with the Duc de Montpensier, son of Louis Philippe—agitated Europe and especially England, because they were expected to make French influence supreme in Madrid: they were also said to be a breach of engagements made between the French and English governments. But their importance was overrated. They did not change political conditions in Spain. Francis, the Prince Consort, weak in body and mind, took no part in the government. The queen mother, Christina, remained the head of the court.

Under the system of dictatorship, the government, whether Progressist or Moderate, never followed the procedure prescribed by the constitutions. It settled by a simple decree matters which should have been voted under form of a law. It suspended by decree the constitutional guarantees of personal liberty or established martial law; it was thus able to arrest its opponents, suspend their publications, and forbid public meetings. As for the taxes, which by all the constitutions should pass the Cortes before being levied, they were not once regularly imposed from 1834 to 1850; the ministry merely obtained a previous authorization from the Cortes to draw up a budget and levy necessary taxes.

The Moderates, once established in power, although they had still to put down the Republican insurrections of 1848, were chiefly occupied with financial regulations. They organized a uniform system of direct taxes on consumption and on callings.

The debt was consolidated and fixed officially at \$600,000,000, and the budget was almost balanced. The customs tariff of 1849 suppressed many prohibitions, lowered and regulated the duties on foreign articles.

The Concordat of 1851 and the Breaking up of Parties.—When Isabella was established on the throne, the absolutists abandoned the Carlists little by little and rallied to the support of the government. The Moderate party, transformed by these new recruits, became more and more like the old absolutist party. The *camarilla* formed again about Christina, then about Isabella, and governed sometimes through the ministers, sometimes in opposition to them. In January, 1851, Christina got rid of Narvaez and called her personal supporters to the ministry.

The Moderate party broke up between 1851 and 1854; the Liberals detached themselves from it. The Moderates, left in power with Christina's support, adopted an absolutist policy to satisfy the aristocracy and the clergy, who were now reconciled with the crown; they wished to re-enforce the Church's authority in the monarchy. This was the time of general reaction in Europe following the excitements of 1848.*

Church affairs were the first to be settled. The government, independently of the Cortes, signed with the Pope the Concordat of March, 1851, whereby all Church affairs were to be regulated according to canonical form. "Catholicism is the national religion, all others are forbidden. Instruction in the public schools must be in harmony with religion." The bishops received power to oversee the purity of the faith, and the religious education of children. "The government will lend its support to the bishops when they ask it to oppose any enterprise of a nature to pervert the minds of believers and corrupt their morals; also to prevent the publication, circulation, and introduction of evil books." Thus the government gave the clergy control of education and a censorship of books, and put itself at the service of the ecclesiastical authority. In return the Pope consented to the abolition of Church jurisdiction and recognised the sale of Church property; but the government promised to respect the property not sold and authorized the Church to acquire new lands.

In political matters, the ministers, in December, 1852, prepared a series of projects for the reform of the constitution; they wished

*This movement is marked in Spain by Balmès' philosophy and the writings of Donoso Cortès, for which the Catholic party made a European reputation.

to make the constitution conform with practice by officially recognising the right of the government to govern without the Cortes. The budget was to be permanent; the laws were to be made by the Crown and the Council of State; relations with the Church were to be settled by the Crown and the Pope. The Cortes were to lose the publicity of their meetings, the Senate to become hereditary, the number of deputies to be reduced from 349 to 171 and their property qualification raised. A decree had created a special system against the press; crimes against public order and society were judged by a jury composed of the heaviest taxpayers; in the provinces the governor, or prefect, could impose a fine by administrative process. The government might suspend or suppress "any publication showing tendencies dangerous to the fundamental principles of society."

The Liberal Union and the Revolution of 1854.—This system ended in a revolution. The Moderates, left out of the ministry, formed a coalition with the Progressists, with Narvaez at their head. The generals led the opposition. In the Senate it was shown by allusions to Christina's husband, who was accused of securing concessions for railroads. The government replied by suspending the Cortes. The generals set on foot military revolts; the ministry put down two of them, but was defeated by the third. A Moderate general, O'Donnell, together with the director-general of the cavalry, organized it at Madrid; Espartero, once more leader of the Progressists, joined them in Aragon. This time the people in Madrid built barricades and fought for three days, sacking the ministers' houses and murdering the police agents. Christina was obliged to flee, leaving Isabella at the mercy of the insurgents. The revolution of July, 1854, was a victory for the generals and the democrats of the large cities over the court and clergy. The army gained by it: all the officers were advanced a grade.

O'Donnell and Espartero, having secured control of the power, governed together from 1854 to 1856. Espartero, president of the council, was supported by the Progressists; O'Donnell, minister of war, had created a new party, the *Liberal Union*, formed of seceders from the old parties, the *Desengannados* or Disillusioned Ones, favouring a liberal constitutional monarchy, a happy mean between the absolutism of the former Moderates and the anarchy of the Progressists.

In this coalition government the Progressists had at first the chief influence. They armed the militia (national guard) and

convoked a Cortes to draw up a constitution; the majority in the assembly was Progressist. The Progressist officials dismissed in 1843 were reinstated, and the years that had elapsed since their dismissal were to count as years of service. The Council of State was suppressed, taxes on articles of food abolished, and the administrative law of 1821 was re-enacted. The Constitution of 1855 was voted, making the Senate elective. But before the constitution was promulgated the Progressists lost control of the government.

A republican party had been formed, chiefly in the northwestern provinces, demanding universal suffrage, liberty of holding public meetings and the abolition of military conscription. At Barcelona the workingmen, organized in secret societies, revolted, massacred a number of employers, and took possession of the city. The Carlists revolted for the defence "of religion." The Progressists, who were in power, in order to meet these uprisings, suspended the guarantees of liberty, an action which brought them into conflict with the democrats.

Queen Isabella broke with the Progressists when they expressed a desire to meddle with Church property. The law of *disamortization* passed by the Cortes ordered the sale of all mortmain property, that of the state, of the communes, of charitable institutions, and of the clergy. The government was to reimburse the clergy by giving them 3 per cent. bonds. Isabella refused to sanction this law and threatened to abdicate; she would show, she said, "that a Queen could make sacrifices for her faith."

In the ministry, O'Donnell was already in open conflict with the Progressists; the Queen took his part and asked him to form a ministry. The Progressist deputies protested. The Madrid militia revolted. O'Donnell won the victory. After this he suppressed the militia, dismissed the Cortes, and restored the Constitution of 1845, adding to it the *Additional Act*, which guaranteed the Cortes a yearly session of 4 months and the presentation of the budget at the opening of the session.

But the old Moderate party, strengthened by the defeat of the Progressists, resumed its influence over the Queen. She dismissed O'Donnell and formed the Narvaez ministry of Moderates only, October, 1856. This ministry abolished what was left of the revolution of 1854: the *Additional Act*, the law of disamortization, and the administrative law; they restored the former system and even aggravated the press law. This reaction lasted two years under three ministries.

In 1858 Isabella recalled O'Donnell. He held the government five years without interruption, and the Cortes completed their legal term without being dissolved—an unprecedented thing. The Liberal Union supported the government as “the only way to escape anarchy on one hand, or despotism on the other.” It was a third party between the two old extreme parties. O'Donnell's policy consisted in avoiding bitter conflicts in domestic affairs by taking no decisive measures, and in turning public attention to foreign policy. He restored the law of disamortization, but by an agreement with the Holy See, whereby the right of acquiring property was recognised in the Church. He promised a liberal press law, but did not present it. On the other hand, he brought Spain into the Morocco war, the conquest of San Domingo, the Mexican expedition, and the trouble with Peru. He added to the deficit of the ordinary budgets a deficit of the special budget, estimated at \$50,000,000. The Liberal Union gradually lost its supporters; the Queen returned to the Moderates in 1863, and in 1864 restored Narvaez.

The Revolution of 1868.—The return of the Moderates to power began to make apparent the transformation of parties and public opinion in Spain. The absolutists, abandoning the Carlists little by little, had gone over to the Queen's support; the Moderates, thus re-enforced, gave up their constitutional and liberal views to become absolutist and Catholic. Isabella, feeling no longer obliged to lean on the Liberals, revived the tradition of Catholic absolutism and government by the *camarilla*; the most influential persons about her were the favourite Marfori, Father Cirile, a Franciscan who had become Bishop of Toledo, Father Claret, formerly a soldier, now a bishop, and Sister Patrocinio, condemned by the courts for simulating the scars of the Passion. The Queen's husband, who was on openly bad terms with the Queen, had almost no influence. The *camarilla* was hostile to O'Donnell and urged the Queen to display her devotion to Catholicism. She refused until 1864 to recognise the Kingdom of Italy, and the diplomats had to remonstrate with her before she would pardon the Spanish Protestants condemned to the galleys.

The Liberal parties, out of hatred to the *camarilla*, became revolutionary. The Progressist party declared itself, by a manifesto, unwilling to take further part in the elections. Since 1863 it had presented no candidates, believing that nothing short of revolution would improve the situation. A democratic party,

favouring universal suffrage and a republic, was constituted in the maritime provinces, Catalonia, Valencia, and Andalusia, and in Madrid. The opposition was no longer directed against the ministry; it attacked the dynasty itself, exciting public opinion against the scandals of the court.

The Moderate ministry replied with a blow at journalists and professors. Every article, before being printed, must be submitted to the authorities, who might forbid it, and the paper might be suspended at the third warning given for these unpublished articles. Castelar, a democratic professor at the University of Madrid, was excluded from his chair. The rector was dismissed; the students wished to give him a serenade, which the government authorized, then forbade. The result was a riot, in which a hundred were killed and wounded. The government ordered the dissolution of all clubs in which politics were discussed.

The Progressists endeavoured to excite the army against the dynasty; General Prim, an exile, organized insurrections. The first miscarried. That of Madrid, in June, 1866, was the work of the artillery sergeants, who were discontented with service in an army where all official positions were reserved for the pupils of a certain school; it resulted in numerous executions. The government became a military dictatorship with absolutist principles. Gonzalez Bravo, Minister of the Interior, said in the decree dissolving the Cortes: "The time has come for the Spaniards to be governed in the spirit of their history and the sentiments which form their real character." The Liberal Union protested against military rule; the government dissolved the Cortes, arrested the leaders of the party, and in December, 1866, exiled from Madrid Marshal Serrano, the President of the Senate. The leaders of the Liberal Union fled to France.

The absolutist ministry held its place, in spite of general discontent, as long as Narvaez lived. This leader put down all revolts, and, having had a new Cortes elected, he got his measures approved and carried a law authorizing him to expel from his home, and later to imprison, any citizen regarded as a *suspect*. The speech from the throne announced administrative and educational reforms to "fortify the policy of firm resistance to revolution" and to maintain "the tradition of the common action of Church and state." The Pope sent Queen Isabella the golden rose.

After Narvaez' death, in 1868, Gonzalez Bravo wished to continue the system. But he realized that the army was slipping

away from him; he had several of the generals arrested and imprisoned and the Duke of Montpensier driven from Spain. Then the leaders of the three persecuted parties,—Liberal Union, Progressists, and Democrats,—after long negotiation, agreed to make a joint revolution. They took advantage of the moment when the Queen was at the French frontier busy negotiating with Napoleon III. for the substitution of Spanish troops for the French troops defending the Pope in Rome.

The Revolution began with the *pronunciamiento* of Admiral Topete, commander of the Cadiz fleet; followed by a *pronunciamiento* signed by the principal generals of the opposition, Prim and Serrano. The cry was: "Down with the Bourbons! Long live national sovereignty!" the declared object was to establish a provisional government and universal suffrage as the "foundation of political and social regeneration." It was Andalusia that first declared for revolution. There was only one small battle, at Alcolea, near Cordova, on September 29. After this Madrid, then all Spain, joined the insurgents. Isabella was deserted and fled to France.

The Constitution of 1869.—The provisional government was set up at Madrid and recognised by all the insurrectional juntas of the 48 provinces. It consisted of the leaders of the allied parties, 5 Progressists, 4 Unionists, and 1 Democrat. Generals Prim and Serrano were the actual heads. In a circular to foreign nations, and in a manifesto to the people, they proclaimed the principles of the new system: sovereignty of the people, religious and educational liberty, and liberty of the press. These principles were recognised by all supporters of the revolution; all called themselves enemies to the absolutism of court and clergy as "opposed to the spirit of the century."

They were not agreed as to the form of government to adopt. The Progressists and the Liberal Union wanted a monarchy "surrounded by democratic institutions," with a new dynasty chosen by the nation.

The Democratic party was divided: the Madrid Democrats accepted the centralized monarchy; those of Catalonia, Aragon, and Valencia favoured a federal republic. The provisional government declared that the decision would be left to the Cortes summoned to make a constitution.

The Cortes of 1869, elected by universal suffrage, 1 deputy for each 45,000 souls, was in great majority composed of partisans of the coalition. They voted by 214 votes against 71 for the mon-

archy, with a liberal democratic constitution: the Cortes to consist of two houses, a "Congress" elected for 3 years by universal suffrage, a Senate elected for 12 years by special electors. All creeds were declared free; for the first time Spain dared to inscribe religious liberty in a constitution.

The Republicans replied with the "Compact of Tortosa" between the 11 provinces of the old crown of Aragon; they demanded a federal republic and organized party committees.

The Carlists had already issued a manifesto in 1868; they declared themselves in favour of "the national kingship," against a foreign monarchy, and for "unity of faith," against religious liberty. Their candidate was Don Carlos VII., grandson of the youngest brother of the former Don Carlos.

While awaiting the choice of a King, the Cortes gave the regency to Marshal Serrano, by 193 votes against 45. The Carlists immediately revolted, under the leadership of the priests. Serrano suspended the guarantees and put down the insurrection. He then asked the bishops for the names of the priests who had left their churches to make war, and ordered them to summon the faithful to obey the government.

Irritated by religious liberty, which seemed an insult to the old faith, the clergy fought the constitutional party. The government wanted to make the clergy swear obedience to the constitution; all the bishops refused, except one. The government ceased to pay the ecclesiastical salaries. The Cortes voted to adopt civil marriage. This was open war between the clergy and the revolution.

At the same time the constitutional coalition broke up over the choice of a king. The Liberal Union proposed the Duc de Montpensier, while the Progressists and Democrats wanted a foreign prince. The Unionists left the ministry. Prim, until his death, governed in the name of the Progressists. He spent a year in seeking the future King of Spain. He offered the crown to the son of the King of Portugal, to the Duke of Genoa, son of the King of Italy, and to the Catholic Prince of Hohenzollern-Sigmaringen; this latter offer caused the Franco-Prussian war. All the offers were refused.

Finally Amadéo, Duke of Aosta, son of Victor Emmanuel, consented to accept the Spanish crown. The Cortes elected him by 191 votes against 115. But when he arrived in Spain, toward the end of December, 1870, Prim had just been assassinated. The new King was openly opposed by a Republican party and

two monarchical parties—the Carlists and the Unionists. He had also against him fanatical patriots, who called him the *foreigner*, the nobles, who were unhappy at seeing Democrats in the palace (they put on their hats upon the King's entrance at the opera), and finally the clergy, who objected to a constitutional King. His power was so weak that at the elections of March, 1871, his partisans gained a bare majority. There were 185 deputies in the opposition, including 60 Republicans and 65 Carlists.

Amadéo wished to govern as a parliamentary King. He chose his ministers from the majority formed by Progressists and Democrats, the remnant of the coalition that had compassed the revolution of 1868. But this coalition, left without a recognised leader by the death of Prim, broke into two hostile factions, the Progressists with Sagasta, the Radicals with Ruy Zorilla, two civil leaders. There was no longer a majority. The ministry resigned. The King protested against these changes, "which are only the result of intrigues between parties or groups"; but he did not succeed in forming a conciliation ministry. He called upon both parties in turn: he took a Radical ministry in July, 1871, which sent him on a tour of the Republican provinces in the northeast; then two Progressist ministries, in October and December, 1871, under whose advice he dissolved the Cortes. The Progressist ministry obtained a strong majority, 229 against 137, with 18 doubtful. The Carlists then revolted; the majority prepared to establish a military dictatorship, according to Spanish custom in case of trouble. But no one could persuade the King to sign the decree; the Progressist ministry retired in June, 1872.

The two former monarchist parties, the Moderates and the Liberal Union, after making overtures to one another, became one. Isabella had abdicated in favour of her son, Alphonso, who was still a minor; Montpensier supported him as the legitimate representative of the hereditary constitutional monarchy. The combined Moderates and Unionists became the Alphonsists, who, in June, 1872, pronounced themselves in favour of Alphonso with Montpensier as regent.

The Radical Cordova-Zorilla ministry announced its decision in favour of "restoring peace without special measures" by observing the constitution. It had a new Cortes elected in which the majority was Radical. The ministry proposed great reforms; compulsory military service, support of public worship by the provinces and communes, exclusion of the clergy from political

and administrative offices. The bishops protested. Then came the conflict with the artillery officers. These had put one of their number, Hidalgo, under "boycott," for favouring the Republican insurrection of the sergeants in 1866; the ministry appointed him captain-general of the Basque provinces; the officers protested, demanded his recall, and then resigned in a body. This was open war between the Radical government and the two most powerful bodies in Spain, the clergy and the army officers.

The Republic (1873-74).—Amadéo had had enough of this democratic royalty and the isolation in which the aristocracy left him and his court. The *grandees* had, contrary to custom, made no demonstration at the birth of his child. He abdicated and left Spain; on February 12, 1873, the Cortes proclaimed the Republic by 256 votes against 32, and elected a ministry.

The Republicans were not long in dividing. The Radicals, who supported the Republic, wished to preserve a centralized system and keep the Cortes elected in 1872, in which they had a majority. The old Republicans, elected by the provinces of Aragon and Andalusia, demanded a federal republic and the election of a new Cortes to make a new constitution. The Radicals rested on the Cortes, the Federalists on the ministry, in which the Cortes itself, under the pressure of opinion, had put the former leaders of the federalist Republicans: Castelar, an Andalusian, and Pi y Margall, a Catalanian. The conflict ended in a *coup d'état*. The Cortes, in adjourning in March, had left a standing committee, composed of a majority of Radicals and Alphonsists. The generals offered to rid them of the Federalist ministry; the ministry got ahead of them, drove out the committee, and convoked a Cortes for the making of a constitution (May, 1873).

The new Cortes was Federalist and elected a Federalist ministry, which proposed a federative constitution copied from the United States: Spain to be divided into self-governing states, and the Church to be separated from the state. But the Federalists agreed only in principle; they differed as to the extent of territory to be given to the states. Should each state consist of one of the old historic provinces, or one of the 48 new ones, or of a still smaller subdivision, a *canton*? Must a single state be made of Andalusia or Sevilla, of Cadiz or Cordova? The first president, Pi y Margall, a translator and disciple of Proudhon, inclined toward self-governing cantons. The *Cantonists* took advantage of this to revolt at Sevilla, Malaga, Cadiz, and Alcoy; they called themselves *intransigents*, declaring themselves so-

cialists and partisans of the International. At Alcoy the insurgents massacred a number of employers and set fire to factories with petroleum. They seized the fortified city of Carthagena, and, with the aid of the galley-slaves, defended themselves there until January, 1874.

In July, 1873, the Cortes, finding Pi too much of a Cantonist, gave the power to Salmeron, professor at the University of Madrid, an avowed adversary of capital punishment. Then, to oppose the Carlists and Cantonists, they voted the re-establishment of martial law, which permitted the shooting of insurgents. Salmeron retired in September, 1873.

The Cortes gave the presidency to the leader of the moderate Republicans, Castelar the orator, and then adjourned until the end of the year in order to give him time to restore order. Castelar, provisionally renouncing federalism and liberal government, returned to Spain's traditional resource—a centralized military dictatorship. He suspended constitutional liberties by decree, forbidding any Spaniard to leave his home without permission, commanding newspapers not to excite insurrection or approve any rebellious act, also restoring the system of warnings and suspensions for the press.

When the Cortes came together again, Castelar called for a vote of thanks, which was refused. General Pavia, governor of Madrid and a friend of Prim, offered Castelar to rid him of the Cortes. Castelar refused and resigned on January 2, 1874. Pavia made his *coup d'état* alone; without leaving the Cortes time to elect another president, he invaded their hall with his troops, on January 3, and drove out the deputies. He then handed over the power to a committee of Progressists and monarchist Radicals, under the generals. The army once more controlled the government.

The new ministry announced its intention to preserve the republic with the Constitution of 1869, and promised to convoke the Cortes, as soon as order was restored. Meanwhile, there was a military dictatorship. The government suspended the guarantees, suppressed Carlist and Cantonist publications, dissolved all political societies "which conspired by word or deed against the public safety and national honour." Marshal Serrano was appointed president of the executive power.

During all these struggles the Carlist insurrection was going on. It was a repetition of the first Carlist war. The insurgents operated at once in the west, in the Basque provinces, and in

Navarre, with a practically regular army of mountaineers, amounting to 30,000 men—in the east, in Catalonia, and the Maestrazgo, with ill-disciplined bands. Don Carlos' capital was Estella, in Navarre. As before, the peasants, incited by the priests, fought on their side or helped them secretly; while the cities resisted them. They besieged Pampeluna and Bilbao without being able to take them. As before, it was a barbaric war; prisoners were often massacred; the Carlists even shot the correspondent of a German newspaper. They broke up the railroads, fired on the trains or stopped them, and even, in Catalonia, forbade any railroad employee to approach the track under penalty of being shot.

The Restoration of 1874.—Serrano's military dictatorship satisfied neither Republicans nor Monarchists. The generals were tired of the republic and went over to the Alphonsist party. Alphonso, on attaining his majority, November 28, 1874, pronounced in favour of the constitutional monarchy: "I shall never cease to be a good Spaniard and a good Catholic like all my predecessors, and, as a man of the century, a true liberal."

The restoration was at hand. Martinez Campos proclaimed it in the *pronunciamiento* of Murviedro, December 29, 1874; the other generals joined him. Serrano offered no resistance. Alphonso XII. was recognised as King of Spain. The power passed into the hands of the Alphonsist coalition of Moderates and Unionists. Their leader was a former disciple of O'Donnell, a civilian named Canovas del Castillo.

The ministry governed for two years under the form of a dictatorship. It was busied at first with fighting the Carlists and conciliating the clergy. The Carlists made a long resistance. Finally, in February, 1876, the two armies that were operating against them forced them to take refuge in France.

The clergy had supported the Carlists, the Pope having declared Carlos VII. the legitimate King. In order to reconcile them, the government raised the church appropriation from \$150,000 to thirty times that amount, and promised to settle the arrears of church salaries so far as the war expenses would allow. It closed the Protestant chapels and schools that had been established since the Revolution, abolished civil marriage, and declared that the state would settle its relations with the Church in harmony with the Holy See. The Pope thereupon consented to recognise Alphonso. But the settlement was difficult to make. The nuncio demanded a return to the Con-

cordat of 1851 and the unity of the faith. The committee appointed to draft a plan of constitution had divided into two parties: the Moderates wished to restore the Constitution of 1845, while the Unionists and Progressists, united under the name of *Constitutionalists*, upheld the Constitution of 1869; they managed to agree on a mixed scheme which admitted religious toleration.

The Cortes, finally elected in January, 1876, and composed of ministerial deputies, voted the constitution, including Article 1: "The Apostolic Catholic religion of Rome is the national religion; the nation assumes the obligation of supporting religion and its servants. No one is to be disturbed on account of his religious opinions nor for the form of his worship, provided he does not violate the respect due to Christian morality. Public exhibitions and ceremonies of any other than the national religion are forbidden."* The Pope protested against "the toleration of non-Catholics as an attack on the truth and on the rights of the Church."

The government next regulated the condition of the Basque provinces. In 1876 it set up as a principle "the constitutional unity of Spain." This meant the abolition of the *fueros*, in spite of the protests of the Basque delegates. The government ordered the local authorities to declare that they submitted in principle to the Spanish laws. On the other hand, it made the concession that these laws should be applied only gradually and that the local administrations should be preserved. But it began the work of assembling the new recruits for the army by sending a large army of occupation, to avoid troubles (1877); it also levied direct taxes and dismissed the councils that protested. Thus the second Carlist war ended in the complete union of Spain.†

The dictatorship was declared at an end and constitutional guarantees restored in the last part of 1876; but the decrees that had organized the dictatorship were not abrogated; the government held the press and public meetings at its mercy.

* The restrictions on religious liberty gave rise to a jurisprudence which forbade to non-Catholics any religious act in the street, any placard or emblem on the outside walls of buildings. The "respect due to Christian morality" has been interpreted to condemn any person who refused to remove his hat in presence of a religious procession, or of the viaticum, and to regard as a crime public mockery of a Catholic dogma.

† The Cuban insurrection, begun toward 1868, was not put down until 1878. Martinez Campos was sent to Cuba, and restored peace by making terms with the insurgents.

The Constitutional Monarchy.—The Constitution of 1876 established a liberal constitutional monarchy: the King inviolable, the ministers responsible, and the Cortes divided into two houses: a *Congress* elected by the taxpayers and a *Senate* composed of dignitaries, life members, and members elected by the provincial councils. In reality the Cortes is always, as before the revolution, of the same opinion as the ministry, and the choice of the ministry depends on the personal will of the sovereign. The King is thus master of the government.

Alfonso XII. had received a foreign military education; he busied himself almost exclusively with the army, endeavouring to organize it on the German model and to restore discipline in the official corps; he refused to restore revolted officers to their rank. He left civil affairs to the prime minister. Thus was formed a regular system of government, parliamentary in appearance, which is still in operation. The government appears to rest on the majority in the Cortes; even ministerial crises occur, apparently brought on by political questions, but in reality by personal rivalry between certain party leaders, among whom the sovereign makes his choice from variable motives.

The parties were reorganized under new names. There were two constitutional monarchist parties, who held the power alternately. The *Conservatives* wished to maintain the system established by the restoration, and accepted only financial and military reforms; they were supported by the clergy and aristocracy. The *Liberals*, also called *Constitutionalists*, later the *Dynastic Left*, declared their acceptance of the Constitution of 1869; they demanded the return to civil marriage, liberty of the press and of association, and jury trial; also extensions of suffrage until universal suffrage should be reached. This party, formed by former Progressists, has been enlarged by a number of Unionists and a fraction of the Democrats. Both parties are led by veterans of the revolution, the Conservatives by Canovas del Castillo, the Liberals by Sagasta. Outside of the constitution still exists the Carlist party of the north, very much enfeebled, and the Republican party, supported chiefly in the maritime provinces of the east. The Republicans were at first a united party, but about 1883 they divided into sections which have at times tried to work together: socialist Federalists,* under Pi y Margall; democratic

*The secret society of the *Black Hand*, discovered in 1883 among the peasants of Andalusia, seems to have been only a local movement; the scheme is supposed to have had in view the equal distribution of wealth.

Progressists, favouring revolution, under Zorilla and Salmeron; and Possibilists, under Castelar, who finally decided to support royalty.

The Conservative party that brought about the restoration was in control a long time. But Canovas, weakened by his rivalry with Martinez Campos, since 1879 general under the restoration, was abandoned by the King in his conversion of the debt in 1881. Then began a series of Liberal ministries, directed by the Sagasta-Martinez Campos coalition, and lasting until 1884. Then Canovas was restored to power and fought against the Republican press.

At the death of Alphonso in November, 1885, his widow, Maria Christina, an Austrian princess, took the regency in the name of the child about to be born, who became Alphonso XIII. She then governed in her son's name. She seemed at first to summon Liberals to the ministry by preference. In 1890 universal suffrage was restored, with the consent of the Conservative party. Universal suffrage seems to have made little change in the practical conditions of political life; the ministry continues to have the majority. Of late years the Queen Regent has rested more on the Conservative party. A Canovas ministry was maintained from July, 1890, to December, 1892, in spite of Republican protest; it resigned before the excitement produced in Madrid by Conservative administration of the municipality. But the Sagasta ministry, on its return to power, did not dare keep up the system of repression organized by Canovas against the Republicans. It weakened its position by announcing the intention of making certain economies to check the alarming growth of the deficit. The opposition was so strong that it had been able to elect 120 deputies (60 Conservatives, 50 Republicans, and even a few Carlists); the ministry could detach from the Republican party only a small group of *possibilists*, who rallied to the support of the monarchy, and it was vigorously opposed in the Cortes. The new taxes were received with riots in the Basque country and in Catalonia. Martinez Campos, governor of Catalonia, having put down a riot with great difficulty, the Anarchists of Barcelona made two attempts with bombs, one upon his family at the theatre in Barcelona, the other upon himself. The Liberal ministry replied with executions, special laws, and prosecutions against suspected Anarchists, who have accused the government of using means akin to torture in order to extract confessions. In the meantime the ministry had been driven by public opinion

into a petty war in Morocco. At length, after two reconstructions of the ministry in 1894, the Cuban revolt of 1895, with its increasing dangers for the monarchy, brought back the Canovas ministry (December, 1895). The Cuban war and, since 1896, the war against the insurgents in the Philippines, have cost much in money and men, and have absorbed all Spain's political activity.

Insurrections have become very rare; *pronunciamentos* have ceased. Spain seems to have grown accustomed to a civil government; some of the generals in 1889 even complained to the Cortes that the army no longer played the part to which it was entitled, and that the cabinets were no longer presided over by generals. The officers were also indignant at certain newspaper articles against the army; in 1889 they demanded press jurisdiction for councils of war, and in 1895 groups of officers invaded the offices of several opposition journals at Madrid.

PORTUGAL.

The Constitution of 1826.—Portugal, at the end of the eighteenth century, was, like Spain, governed by the *camarilla* and clergy; the absolute sovereign left the power to his court. The Cortes met no longer, and the grandees were pushed aside. Catholicism was obligatory; the Church controlled the censorship of books, education, and the Inquisition.

As in Spain, regeneration began with foreign occupation. The English army sent to drive out the French took possession of the country and organized the Portuguese army. The royal family had, in 1809, fled to Brazil before the French invasion, and remained there even after the restoration. Portugal was governed despotically by the English general Beresford, who was appointed commander-in-chief with a junta of regency to assist him. The government persecuted secret societies in particular. A decree of 1818 made it treason to join one. "Whosoever sells, gives, lends, or hands to another a medal, seal, symbol, picture, book, catechism, or instruction relating to these cursed societies shall be punished by transportation of from 4 to 6 years."

As in Spain, it was the army that overturned this system. It was discontented with receiving no pay and having to obey foreign commanders; many officers who had become Liberals, if not Free Masons, by reading foreign books or by contact with the English, desired a constitution. A plot to drive out the English in 1817 had met with cruel repression. But in 1820, at the

news of the Spanish insurrection, the Portuguese army also revolted; first, in the north at Oporto. Beresford was in Brazil at the time, warning the King of the danger he ran if the army were not paid. The insurgents formed a provisional government which refused to admit Beresford on his return from Brazil, and asked the King to return. They complained that Portugal was being governed as a Brazilian colony. The King, John VI., convoked the Cortes to draft a constitution; it adopted the Constitution of 1822, copied from the Spanish Constitution of 1812. The King accepted it.

Two parties were formed, *Constitutionalists* and *Absolutists*. The Constitutionalists, divided into two parties, as in Spain, were at first intrusted with the power. But the restoration of 1823 in Spain encouraged the Absolutists; the King gave them the government, and restored the old historic constitution, the pretended Charter of Lamego.

As in Spain, it was a conflict over the succession that definitively established the constitutional system. John died in 1820, leaving two sons. The elder, Pedro, had remained in Brazil and had just proclaimed himself Emperor there. The other, Miguel, had returned to Portugal with his father and became the head of the Absolutist party; but in 1824, having attempted an insurrection against his father, he had been driven from the country. Pedro, not wishing to come and reign in Portugal, yielded his rights to his seven-year-old daughter, Maria da Gloria, and promulgated the Constitutional Charter of 1826. This was a granted charter, and established a constitutional monarchy like that of Louis XVIII. in France.

The Cortes consisted of two houses, the hereditary House of Peers and the House of Deputies, elected for four years by propertied voters, the election being indirect. The Cortes had the legislative power, voting the budget and the laws, subject to the King's sanction. The executive power belonged to the King, who exercised it through his ministers. The constitution also attributed to the King the *moderating power*, conceived by Benjamin Constant; this was the right to dissolve the house, create peers, choose and dismiss the ministers—all the rights exercised by the constitutional monarchs of the period. There was nothing new in it but the phrasing of it. The constitution guaranteed in principle all the liberties of citizens—liberty of the person, of property, of residence, of the press, and of petition. Religious equality was not granted; Catholicism remained the religion of

the kingdom, but it was admitted that "no one ought to be disturbed on account of his religion." But all these guarantees might be suspended by a law or even a royal decree.

Pedro had chosen his brother Miguel as his daughter's guardian and regent, on condition that he should recognise the constitution and promise to marry the young Queen; meanwhile he intrusted the regency to his sister. The Absolutist party revolted, demanding Miguel as King, but the Regent succeeded in maintaining her position, thanks to Canning's English army (1826). But when, in 1828, the English government (Wellington) changed its policy, Miguel returned to Portugal.

He declared himself ready to accept the constitution and recognised Queen Maria; but he gave the power to the Absolutists and the clergy and dismissed the houses. He then convoked the Cortes according to the old Constitution of Lamego, and proclaimed himself King in 1829. He was supported by the army and clergy. Then began the persecution of the Liberals. According to Liberal traditions, there were, in six years, 17,000 persons executed, 16,000 transported, and 26,000 imprisoned. Miguel even arrested a number of Frenchmen and Englishmen; an English fleet, followed by a French fleet, came in 1831 to force him to give satisfaction.

Maria's supporters joined the Liberals in the struggle with Miguel.

The Azores Islands had remained faithful to Queen Maria. With the aid of the English, an expedition was prepared in these islands to reconquer Portugal. Pedro had abdicated the Empire of Brazil and was once more in Europe directing operations. The war was a long one. In 1832 Pedro had taken possession of Oporto, a Liberal centre, but could go no further. An army sent by sea to the extreme south forced Miguel to evacuate Lisbon. He continued the war in the interior with the aid of Don Carlos. The Quadruple Alliance sent a Spanish army, which finally drove Miguel from the kingdom in 1834. The Constitution of 1826 was restored. Maria became of age, and married a prince of Coburg, a kinsman of the King of Belgium. The monasteries were suppressed.

Struggles between Chartists and Septembrists (1834-52).—When Miguel was conquered he had promised, in consideration of a yearly allowance, to renounce the crown and never return to Portugal. The Absolutist party had no longer a part to play. As in Spain, the Liberals were divided into two parties. The

Chartists wished to maintain the Charter of 1826, which gave the King all the real power; the *Septembrists* wanted the Constitution of 1822, establishing the sovereignty of the people.

As in Spain, political struggles concealed personal rivalries. As in Spain, the parties fought by means of military insurrections; the officers, restive at receiving no promotion, and the soldiers at receiving no pay, determined which party should have the mastery. As in Spain, the elections always gave the majority to the party in power. But in Portugal the revolutions have been less violent, repression less cruel, and the oratorical contests less dramatic. The English, who control the wine trade, have often interfered to produce or to moderate political revolutions. The clergy have taken a much less important part than in Spain; it is also said that the Free Masons have had a more continuous influence on politics.

Like the Spanish Moderates, the *Chartists* have been the favourite party at court, the one that has most often occupied the ministry. The mass of the population has remained indifferent to political life. The movements are always set on foot in Lisbon, the capital, or in Oporto, the city of the north and the centre of the wine trade, or in Coimbre, the University city. These three cities support the opposition party, corresponding to the Spanish Progressists; but that party has never been powerful and has rarely taken action except with help from discontented generals or grandees.

In 1836, at the news that the Spanish Progressists had just restored the Constitution of 1812, the Portuguese opposition party brought about a military revolt and forced the Queen to restore the Constitution of 1822. This was the revolution of September, 1836, which gave the party the name of *Septembrists*. The *Septembrists* took the power and reformed the constitution as the Spanish Progressists had done, making the Constitution of 1838, which gave the crown the veto on bills and established two houses.

The *Septembrists* lost the ministry through a military revolution in 1842. The *Chartists* restored the Charter of 1826 and kept the power in spite of insurrections in 1844, 1846, 1847, and 1851. Their leader, Costa Cabral, governed after the fashion of Narvaez. The party then went through an evolution toward absolutism, less marked, however, than that of the Spanish Moderates.

The Regenerators and the Deficit.—As in Spain, an opposition

coalition was formed, similar to the Liberal Union, a coalition between the Septembrists and discontented Chartists. Its leader was the old marshal Saldanha, a Chartist minister who wished to revenge himself on Cabral. The party gave itself the name of *Regenerador*, and undertook to regenerate Portugal.

The revolution of 1852 forced the Queen to give the ministry to the Regenerators. They reformed the Charter by the Additional Act of 1852, establishing direct suffrage and lowering the qualification for voting. Since 1852 the qualification has been so low as to admit nearly a half-million voters.

The party did not remain long united. Saldanha governed as a dictator; the former Septembrists became discontented and left him to form the *Historic Left*, led by a Grand Seignior of the Free Masons, the Marquis of Loulé. Later the *reformist* party was formed, and merged with the Historic Left in 1877 under the name of *Progressists*.

The number of electoral districts was diminished in 1869. Hereditary peerage was abolished in 1885. Representation of minorities was established for the election of deputies by the revision of 1884-85. Payment of deputies has been abolished. The civil codes were finally voted in 1868 and the code of procedure in 1877, conformably to the promise of the Charter of 1826.

The principal difficulty is still in voting the budget. Portugal is burdened with a debt too heavy for her resources, and still further increased by the foreign loans made by Miguel at usurious rates, which the constitutional government has accepted. The deficit, now become chronic, can be met only by loans, and thus the debt goes on increasing.

Several plans for avoiding a deficit have been tried: the number of general officers for an army of 30,000 men was reduced from 142 to 32; a part of the salaries of the office-holders was held back; food taxes were established. Pereira, minister from 1871 to 1877, tried to overcome the deficit by extending commerce and industry.

But the debt still increases. From 39,000,000 milreis in 1853 it had increased in 1873 to 233,000,000, in 1890 to 428,000,000. In forty years, 1853-92, it has increased on an average by 8,000,000 milreis a year.* It was decided in 1892 to suspend payment of the interest on two-thirds of the debt. Financial embarrassments, conflicts with the clergy on the subject of ex-

* The milreis is worth about \$1.20.

communicating Free Masons (1882-84), and with the English government on the question of the African colonies (1889-92) have given Portugal an agitated public life.*

Little by little the parties have been displaced. The former Chartist party has been replaced by the Regenerators, who form the Right; the Progressists form the constitutional Left. Outside of the constitution a Republican party has sprung up in the large cities and among the students and has been organizing clubs and demonstrations since 1881. This party, encouraged by the fall of the monarchical system in Brazil in 1889, has begun a constitutional agitation and even insurrections. The government has replied with special measures and the King has even modified the constitution by decree.†

Portugal has re-entered upon a period of political crises.

BIBLIOGRAPHY.

BIBLIOGRAPHY.‡—See **Ch.-V. Langlois**, "*Manuel de Bibliographie*," 1896. There is not yet an historical bibliography for either Spain or Portugal. On Spanish institutions, **Torres Campos**, "*Bibliog. Españ. Contemp. del Derecho y de la Política*," 1883.

SPAIN.

DOCUMENTS.—For events up to 1840, **Baumgarten** (see below) gives a list of contemporary accounts; the most important are **Miraflores**, "*Memorias para . . . la Hist. Contemp. de . . . Isabel II.*," 1843.—**Burgos**, "*Annales del Reinado de Isabel II.*," 1850; both conservative. For subsequent events, the most reliable accounts are to be found in foreign annuals: "*Annual Register*"; "*Annuaire des Deux Mondes*," up to 1870.—**Schulthess**, "*Europ. Geschichtskalender*," since 1860. See also the political articles in the "*Revista de España*."§

For government acts and *Cortes* documents, see **Torres Campos**, "*Staatsrecht d. K. Spanien*," 1889.

WORKS.—COMPLETE HISTORIES: The great general history of Spain,

* Several times since the Spanish revolution of 1854 there has been talk of an *Iberic Union*; i. e., a union between Spain and Portugal. The idea, originated by Spanish Republicans, has never been popular in Portugal.

† There have been several sovereigns since the death of Maria in 1853: Pedro V. in 1853, Luis I. in 1868, and Carlos I. in 1889.

‡ It has not been possible for me, with the resources at my command in Paris, to draw up a satisfactory bibliography of works in Spanish and Portuguese.

§ I refrain from citing the various descriptions of Spain and Portugal in the manner of *De Amicis*, which give political anecdotes and peculiar customs without naming authorities.

M. de Lafuente, "Hist. General de España," 28 vols. (several edits.) stops at the death of Ferdinand. It is continued by **Pirala**, "Hist. de la Guerra Civil," 2d edit., 1868. "Hist. Contemp." (from 1843 to 1875), 6 vols., 1875. The common faults are prolixity and lack of criticism. For the period previous to 1839, it is best to resort to **Baumgarten**, "Geschichte Spaniens," 3 vols., 1865-71 (*Staatsengesch.* coll.). In French, **Hubbard**, "Hist. Contemp. de l'Espagne," 4 vols. 1882-84, chiefly interesting for the history of political customs.—**Reynald**, "Hist. de l'Espagne jusqu'en 1873," is a poor sketch.

EPISODES: **H. Bruck**, "Die Geheimen Gesellschaften in Spanien," 1881, Catholic, and with little criticism.—**De Mazade**, "Révolutions de l'Esp. Contemp." (1854 to 1868), 1869, gives little more than the "Annuaire des Deux Mondes."—**W. Lauser**, "Gesch. Spaniens von dem Sturz Isabellas," 2 vols., 1877, a fairly good history of the revolutionary period from 1868 to 1875, more accurate than **Cherbuliez** "L'Espagne Politique, 1868-73," 1874.—On the Carlist war: **Valras**, "Don Carlos VII. et l'Espagne Carlista," 2 vols., 1876, Carlist.—**Wedel**, "Die Carlistische Armee und Kriegsführung," 1876, accurate details on means of fighting. In English, **E. H. Stroebel**, "The Spanish Revolution," a good narrative from the fall of Isabella to the accession of Alphonse XII. in 1874, Boston, 1898.

INSTITUTIONS.—For the whole: **Torres Campos**, "Das Staatsrecht d. K. Spanien," 1889 (Marquardsen coll.), picture of the actual organization, with some historic details of the 19th century. On the Cortes, **Borrego**, "Hist. de las Cortes de España durante el siglo XIX.," 2 vols., 1885.—For the administration: **Colmeiro**, "Derecho Admin. de España," 4th edit., 3 vols., 1876-80.

PORTUGAL.

FOR THE COLONIES: **A. Zimmermann**, "Kolonialpolitik Portugals und Spaniens" (in his "Europäische Kolonien" I), Berlin, 1896.

DOCUMENTS.—ON THE PERIOD OF THE FORMATION OF THE CONSTITUTION: "Documentos para a historia das cortes geraes da nação Portuguesa, 1820-28," 4 vols., 1883-87. For the succeeding period see the *Annuaire*; the "Annuaire des Deux Mondes" gives a great deal of information.

WORKS.—I know of no complete history.—**Schaefer**, "Geschichte von Portugal," vol. v., 1854 (Gotha coll.), stops at 1820.—**Arriaga**, "Hist. da Revolução Portuguesa de 1820," 4 vols., 1886-89, very diffuse and declamatory.

POLITICAL INSTITUTIONS: **Tavares de Medeiros**, "D. Staatsrecht d. K. Portugal," 1892 (Marquardsen coll.), gives an historical exposition and a bibliography.

CHAPTER XI.

ITALY.

The Restoration in Italy.—Italy, conquered by the French armies, had been for fifteen years divided into three parts, all subject to the French government: 1st, the Kingdom of Italy (Lombardy, Venetia) under Beauharnais, Napoleon's stepson; 2d, the Kingdom of Naples under Murat, Napoleon's brother-in-law; 3d, the portions annexed to the French Empire (Piedmont, Genoa, Tuscany, Parma, Rome). The two Italian dynasties had fled to the islands, the court of Turin to Sardinia, the Bourbons of Naples to Sicily.

French rule did not give Italians national independence, and it imposed on them heavy military burdens; Napoleon took with him to Russia 27,000 men from the Kingdom of Italy and brought back only 1000. On the other hand, French administration introduced into Italy modern ways, equality before the law, personal liberty, and unity of laws (the Napoleonic code had become Italian law). Convent estates had been secularized. Thus the country had been prepared for political unity, and already a number of patriots were conspiring against Napoleon for the independence of the Italian nation.

The victory of the Allies made Italy's position even worse. They restored everywhere the political arrangements which had prevailed before the Revolution, except in the two Republics of Venice and Genoa, which were not re-established. The other provinces were given back to their former owners, and Italy was once more cut up into little states: the Kingdom of Sardinia enlarged by the addition of the former territory of Genoa; the duchies of Tuscany and Modena, given back to two Austrian archdukes; the duchy of Parma, given to the ex-Empress Marie Louise; the principality of Lucca, the States of the Church, the Kingdom of Naples. (Murat, first spared, then driven out, was seized for treason and shot in 1815.) Austria took her former province of Lombardy, added Venetia, and formed the Lombardo-Venetian kingdom. These arrangements, begun in 1814, modified by Napoleon's return in 1815, were not completed until 1817.

All these states were monarchical, and in all of them the restored prince found himself absolute sovereign, free to re-establish the old *régime* in his own way.

The King of Sardinia officially re-established ecclesiastical authority, restored to the clergy their control of marriage, set up once more the laws punishing by death the profanation of the Host, abolished religious freedom, re-established ecclesiastical censorship of books and set apart new estates for the Church. The University was placed under a committee of overseers; in the library these locked up dangerous books, such as Montesquieu. In his hatred of France the King expelled by decree several thousands of Frenchmen and ordered the destruction of a botanic garden at Turin, as the work of the invaders. The municipal council, in order to save a bridge over the river Po, menaced by the same motive, had a church built there as a votive offering.

The Duke of Modena re-established the old laws of 1771 and persecuted the Jews. The Duke of Tuscany, in re-establishing the convents, contented himself with giving them an endowment; the former Church lands were left with their lay possessors. Tuscany had been reformed in the eighteenth century by the Emperor Leopold, and so the former system there did not differ materially from that of France.

In the States of the Church the restoration was radical. The civil administration was replaced by Church authority. The Pope re-established the Inquisition and all the convents (1824 monasteries, 612 nunneries). The country was divided into 18 legations, each governed by a Cardinal legate. Lay office-holders were dismissed, the Napoleonic Code abolished. Vaccination and street lighting in Rome were suppressed as French institutions. The Church government busied itself with the pursuit of secret societies, especially the Free Masons. But it was too feeble to suppress the brigands, who, descending from the mountains, plundered even the villas in the outskirts of Rome.

In the Kingdom of Naples, the King preserved the most important of the French institutions: the abolition of the privileges of the nobles, the French civil law and penal code, the administration of the communes by state officials (*intendants*), the system of finance and even the conscription—that is to say, the new social and administrative organization. He showed his hatred of the French by refusing to drive in the new *strada di Posilipo*, which had been built during their rule, and by stopping the excavations at Pompeii, which had been actively pushed

"during the foreign occupation." With the Church he made a compromise; he did not restore all the secularized lands, nor did he re-establish all the convents nor all the bishoprics.*

In 1806 there had been 132 bishoprics for a population of 5,000,000 souls; Murat had reduced the number to 43; the concordat made with the Pope (1818) allowed 19 archbishops and 56 bishops. The restored government was accused of capricious application of the laws; the King voluntarily pardoned the brigands who had fought in his name against the usurper Murat. A mounted band of brigands became so dangerous that the government in 1817 hired them to make war on the other brigands, then had them massacred in cold blood.

In Italy, as in Germany, the restored sovereigns did not entirely restore their former system. From the Revolution they accepted the abolition of the privileges enjoyed by the nobility (majorats,† exemption from taxes, seignioral courts), the secularization of convent lands, and the regulation of administration and finance. What they did restore was mainly the authority of the clergy and the political police; the restored system consisted in the absolute government of the court, police, and clergy.‡

It discontented the Liberals, who had become so numerous in the Italian cities, especially at Milan, at Naples, and in Romagna. These wanted a constitutional liberal government, independent of the Church.

The arrangements made by the Congress of Vienna wounded Italian national sentiment also. Metternich had refused to allow the Congress to establish a committee on Italian affairs like that which had charge of Germany: he showed that Germany was a political body; Italy, on the contrary, "represents simply a group of independent states, united under the same geographical term." Thus was dismemberment made the normal condition of Italy. And in this dismembered Italy foreigners were supreme. A foreigner, the Emperor of Austria, possessed the Lombardo-Venetian Kingdom and sent to Milan, as his governor, an Austrian archduke; the three sovereigns of Tuscany, Modena, and Parma were Austrians.

Even over the sovereigns who were Italian, Austria had an

* The following figures are given, but without satisfactory authority:

1806: 47,008 priests, 25,000 monks, 26,000 nuns

1837: 26,000 " 11,400 " 9,590 "

† A right of persons holding hereditary titles to entail property in conjunction with their titles.—Tr.

‡ Stendhal, who examined this *régime* carefully, gives a description of it in his famous romance, "La Chartreuse de Parme."

almost irresistible influence. She made the King of Naples promise not to introduce into his states institutions incompatible with those of the Lombardo-Venetian Kingdom. Metternich even tried to form between the Italian sovereigns a confederation which Austria would have controlled. The King of Sardinia, supported by the Tsar Alexander, refused to join, and upset the plan.

The political condition of Italy after 1815 may be defined by three characteristics: small states, absolute governments, and dependence upon Austria. Italian patriots and liberals demanded national unity, constitutional government, and the expulsion of outsiders. But they had to wait 30 years for a chance to work together, and agitated at first only by local revolutions.

The Military Revolutions of 1820 and 1821.—The first movements were the work of army officers and secret societies. There existed already in Italy secret societies when it was under French control. The most active of these, the *Carbonara*, had been founded probably about 1807 in the mountains of the Kingdom of Naples and recruited among the charcoal burners of Calabria. Its object was to drive out the French. Its origin is legendary, but its organization is known: the Carbonari were formed in lodges (*ventes*); the members, admitted after a ceremony of initiation, swore to obey the orders of the chiefs; the lodges were federated under the direction of the High Lodge. The *Carbonara* had its principal centre in the Kingdom of Naples; the number of members was estimated at 60,000 after 1816, among whom were many bandits who injured the society by their crimes. The Carbonari were also numerous in the States of the Pope (especially in Romagna) and in Austrian Italy (especially in Lombardy). [After the restoration their aim was changed: their object now was to expel the Austrians and establish a united Italy with constitutional government; the French were no longer their enemies, and so became their allies.]

At the same time Free Masonry was gaining ground in Italy. These two secret societies differed in character: the Carbonari were conspirators ready to lead an armed revolution. The Free Masons had only a humanitarian aim. But both were made up from the same classes, among the liberal middle class, which opposed the power of the clergy, and military officers, who were displeased with the restoration; both were organized in the form of a federation. Perhaps they were in secret connection through some of their chiefs who belonged to both societies; they

were jointly pursued by the governments and condemned by the Pope.* The absolutists tried to oppose them with rival absolutist societies: the *Calderari*, reorganized in 1816 by the minister of police in Naples; the *Sanfedists*, in the States of the Church. They fought each other by denunciations and murders, of which it is impossible to get an exact account.

To tell the truth, the Italian revolutionists did not succeed in organizing any original movement; they made nothing but imitation revolutions, induced by foreign example and based on programs and plans copied from foreigners. It was the Spanish revolution of 1820 that furnished the model for the Italian revolutions; they were military, like their model, at Naples in 1820, at Piedmont in 1821.

At Naples, many of the military officers had served in Murat's army; these "Muratists" reproached the government with refusing them promotion and desired a constitution. Although many officers were Carbonari, there had been no formal conspiracy: the chiefs did not dare to risk an insurrection. The revolution was begun by two sub-lieutenants of cavalry with the cry of "Long live the King and the Constitution!" They led their men toward Naples. The Carbonari followed them; the army did not stop them. The King became alarmed, and announced that he would willingly grant a constitution. Without waiting to draw up one, they promulgated the "Constitution of Spain." The King took the oath, adding an invocation of his own to God, "If I lie or break my oath, hurl the thunderbolt of thy vengeance upon my head." This constitution was democratic, modelled after the French Constitution of 1791, which gave the power to a single chamber. The King reserved the right to get this plan modified by the Assembly. The Assembly was elected and met at Naples; the majority were ready to vote the modifications which would make the constitution acceptable to the French government. But the Carbonari had founded lodges in every regiment and gathered together at Naples a general assembly of delegates from all the provinces; they bullied the government, appointed the police, and managed the work of recruiting. Their supporters in the assembly obstructed the discussion of the constitution.

In Sicily, the Palermo insurgents had first demanded an inde-

* The documents cited to prove a connection (Deschamps, "The Secret Societies and Society") were drawn up too long after the events, or else by too prejudiced witnesses, to make categorical affirmation possible.

pendent government, with a royal prince, so as to permit the existence of a personal union only. But the Sicilians had sent their representatives to the Assembly at Naples, and the people of Palermo, frightened by the prevailing massacres and pillage, concluded to recognise the government of the Neapolitans.

Austria undertook to crush the Naples rebellion. She had refused to recognise the constitution, reminding the King of the promise, made in 1815, that he would not establish in his kingdom any institution contrary to those of the Austrian states. She made preparations to send an army to Naples and re-establish the old government. The Tsar and the French government, after some hesitation, decided against the constitution, and Metternich took advantage of the occasion to secure the formulation of the theory of intervention in countries troubled by revolution. Delegates from the great powers met at Troppau, moved to Laybach, and invited the King of Naples to join them in settling the affairs of his kingdom according to the treaties.

Ferdinand set out, after swearing to the Assembly that he would speak in favour of the constitution; he returned with an Austrian army of 50,000 men sent in the name of the European powers to occupy the Kingdom of Naples and put an end to the government imposed by the Revolution.

The government of Naples got together two small armies, but after the first encounter at Rieti the soldiers disbanded and the Austrians occupied the whole kingdom without resistance. The absolutist party, restored to power, forbade any person, under penalty of death, to have arms in his possession or to wear the colors of the Carbonari. Then began a long period of accusations and prosecutions. Many liberals were condemned to death or the galleys, others were killed in the country or fled to foreign lands. In order to prevent another military revolution, the King, by a capitulation concluded for 30 years with the Swiss cantons, hired four Swiss regiments.

In the Kingdom of Sardinia, the insurrection was begun by the officers of the garrison of Alexandria (March 10, 1821). It was not simply liberal, but *national*. The insurgents swore allegiance to the Spanish Constitution, as at Naples; but in addition they set up the Italian tricolour flag (green, white, and red) and proclaimed the re-establishment of the Kingdom of Italy and its extension over the whole nation. The principal leader of the revolt, the Count of Santa Rosa, announced his intention to deliver the King and the country from the Austrians and prevent

the crushing of Neapolitan freedom. The conspirators counted on Prince Charles Albert of Carignano, who was said to be allied with the Carbonari and acquainted with the plot. The garrison at Turin followed suit and threatened to bombard the city if the King did not accept the constitution.

King Victor Emmanuel preferred to abdicate in favour of his brother, then at Modena. While awaiting the arrival of his successor he appointed as regent the Prince of Carignano, who proclaimed the constitution, swore obedience to it, and gave the power into the hands of a special State Council, until the election of the Assembly. Santa Rosa was made minister of war. But the new King, Charles Felix, was an absolutist and unfriendly to the Prince of Carignano, and he formally disavowed the acceptance of the constitution; he invited those subjects who were still faithful to resist and asked help from the Tsar. Alexander ordered 100,000 men to start. The Austrian army was already on the border. Santa Rosa, when called on by the King to hand in his resignation, asserted that the King was an Austrian prisoner and tried to lead the army and the students to attack Lombardy. The troop of liberals met the Austrians before Novara, and after a short combat dispersed. The leaders took refuge at Genoa, then left the country; a special commission condemned to death 178 of the accused, and 220 officers were discharged; the two universities were closed for a year. Metternich tried to punish the Prince of Carignano by having him deprived of his rights to the throne of Sardinia and to replace him by the Austrian Duke of Modena. But the French government supported the prince, so he was made to do penance by going with the French army to fight the Spanish liberals; he then had to promise never to grant a constitution. In 1831 the older branch expired with Charles Felix, and the Prince of Carignano became King Charles Albert.

There had also been a conspiracy at Milan against the Austrians. The Lombardo-Venetian kingdom was governed by a viceroy (the Austrian archduke Rainier) and an administration partly composed of Italians assisted by councils formed of Italian notables (the two assemblies of Lombardy and Venetia, and the 17 provincial assemblies). Metternich himself, in 1817, recommended the choice of Italians in order to show that Austria did not mean to treat the kingdom as a German province. But the liberals could ill support the Austrian legislation which had abolished jury trial and public procedure,—the secret police that

opened letters and set spies to watch suspected persons,—the censorship which had, in 1819, suppressed the liberal journal *Conciliatore*. A number of liberals, young men of the middle class, conspired at Milan (1820). Thirteen of them were arrested and condemned to death; their sentence was then commuted to imprisonment in the fortress of Spielberg. One of them was Silvio Pellico, who later became famous for his description of his captivity. Another plot in 1821 led to other condemnations.

In the duchy of Modena, where the liberals had conspired with those in Naples, a special commission passed sentence on 47 accused persons.

The Revolution of 1831.—After the failure of the military revolutions all political movement in Italy ceased (except for an uprising of the Carbonari in the Kingdom of Naples in 1827). In the States of the Church, Pope Pius VII. and his minister Gonsalvi, who favoured a pacific policy, had died in 1823 and 1824; Pope Leo XII. (1824-29) pursued a policy of absolutist restoration. He re-established ecclesiastical jurisdiction in civil affairs and the use of Latin in the courts, gave the Jesuits the direction of education and ordered prosecution of the Carbonari. Men were condemned to prison, banishment, or *precetto politico*—that is to say, to reside in a city, forbidden to go out at night, and obliged to report to the police every two weeks and to go to confession every month. Each subject was ordered to denounce any member of a secret society under penalty of the galleys.

A new revolutionary movement broke out at last, in 1830, in the states which had not been in rebellion, and against the weakest governments, at Modena, Parma, and in the States of the Church. This time the French Revolution was taken for a model: the people in the cities rose, as in France, to demand a constitution, a national guard, and liberty of the press.

The committee of Italian refugees prepared an insurrection in the States of the Church, taking advantage of an interregnum offered by the death of Pope Pius VIII., who died in 1830. Their object was uncertain; they talked of proclaiming Jerome Bonaparte or a son of Eugene Beauharnais King of Rome (Louis Napoleon was in the plot), but their great aim was to rid themselves of the government of priests and Sanfedists. The Duke of Modena was warned, had the conspirators arrested at the house of their chief Menotti, and sent for the executioner.

Immediately the conspirators in the States of the Church broke out in insurrection; first at Bologna, then in all the other towns

in Romagna, Umbria, the Marches,—everywhere except in the patrimony of St. Peter. They formed national guards, then they established provisional governments composed of nobles, doctors, and lawyers. There was no fighting; all the laymen, even the soldiers, agreed together to rid themselves of the Church officers. The deputies met at Bologna and declared without debate for “complete release from the temporal rule of the Pope and complete union in a single government.” Then they published a manifesto against the Pope’s administration and organized a central government composed of a president and seven ministers.

A provisional government was installed without resistance at Modena and in the duchy of Parma: there was in each a dictator assisted by three consuls.

The insurgents hoped to be sustained by France, but Louis Philippe would not risk a war. The Austrian army occupied Romagna; the insurgents treated with one of the cardinals, and submitted upon a promise of amnesty (March, 1831). The Duke of Modena was presently restored by the Austrians. The envoys of the European powers met in conference, and presented to the Pope a *memorandum* recommending certain reforms as preventive of a new revolution. The principles proposed were: 1st, That reforms must be made not only in the rebellious provinces, but in Rome; 2d, That laymen must be admitted to all judicial and administrative offices; the communes must have elective municipal councils and there should be a lay state council to restore financial order. This memorandum answered the complaints of the inhabitants, who were mainly irritated at being governed by churchmen. Pope Gregory XVI. had a scheme of reform drawn up; but the cardinals were unwilling to divide the government with laymen; they agreed to reject the election of councillors and the creation of a lay council. They would only agree to create municipal councillors, named by the Pope, and provincial councillors who had not even the right of petition. The finances were still controlled by ecclesiastical congregations; the country was still governed by prelates, the four cardinal legates in the four large provinces, the delegated *Monsignori* in the 17 others.

When the Austrian army withdrew, the liberals re-organized the national guards; the Pope’s soldiers, sadly disciplined, plundered peaceable inhabitants; the legate called back the Austrians, who this time were received as liberators. The French government had declared that if the Austrians interfered again, it would

seize one of the ports as a guarantee; a French garrison arrived at Ancona (1832). This was merely a demonstration; the Pope took the city again, and the garrison was confined in the citadel until 1838.

To secure a defence against the malcontents the pontifical government hired two Swiss regiments for 20 years and encouraged the Sanfedist regiments to organize as volunteers (*militi centurioni*); in 1832 there were 30,000 of them under 30 commanders: they swore to sacrifice their lives and their property for the Church and its head, undertook to act as a police and to watch the liberals. Pope Gregory XVI. was more a theologian than a sovereign and left the government to his secretary of state, Lambruschini, a Genoese absolutist.

Tuscany, being the least despotic of the Italian states, had no revolution; she even received refugees. Some young men in 1831 made a plot to enter the theatre of Florence and ask the Grand Duke for a constitution, but they did not dare do it. The country remained under a paternal absolutism. In 1836, in a population of 1,780,000, there were 10,000 secular priests, 3234 monks, and 4172 nuns.

Mazzini and the Republican Party.—Up to 1831 the malcontents had agitated by local insurrections organized on the spot, and without a common program. Then began attempts to unite all Italy for concerted action.

The first was under Mazzini. He was a Genoese lawyer, an enemy to his sovereign the King of Sardinia. (The Genoese had never reconciled themselves to becoming subjects of a Piedmontese.) He was born in 1808, but had been living in exile in France until 1831; he now changed his revolutionary policy. He transferred the management of the movement to a place outside of Italy and adopted for object the establishment of a united Italy as a republic. In 1831 he founded *Young Italy*, a secret society which admitted only men under forty years of age. Then he again enlarged his program and founded *Young Europe*, to deliver the nations from monarchical governments and to establish everywhere the republic and democracy; each nation should form a republic united to the others by fraternity. In *Young Europe* each country formed a section (in 1844 there were *Young Italy*, *Young Poland*, *Young Germany*, then *Young Switzerland*, *Young France*, and *Young Spain*); the whole was directed by a central committee.

Mazzini was an enemy to the Church, but a deist and a mysti-

cist. His motto was: "Liberty, equality, humanity, a God, a sovereign, and the law of God." Young Italy was recruited mainly among the well-to-do classes: lawyers, doctors, professors, and officers; it formed a revolutionary republican party, hostile to the Carbonari, but employing the same processes,—partial uprisings and the murder of princes and traitors. They accomplished nothing but a series of unsuccessful plots, in Piedmont in 1834, and at Naples in 1844.*

The "Risorgimento."—A pacific movement toward unity began in the world of letters. It was perhaps prepared by the congress of naturalists, organized in imitation of Germany, and held each year in a different city (Pisa, Turin, Florence, Padua). It came suddenly to the front through the publication of some political works which were read all over Italy and produced the effect of manifestoes.

In 1843 Gioberti, a priest and theologian who had sought asylum in France in 1831, published "Moral and Political Headship of Italy." The essential idea of his book was that Italy, destined by God to be the centre of humanity, holds within herself forces sufficient to accomplish her mission; it would suffice for her to get back her unity under the direction of the Pope, who would be at once the chief of Italy and of the world. Since Macchiavelli, the Italians had regarded the Pope as an obstacle to unity; Gioberti made the papacy the centre of the nation. But he accused the Jesuits of having compromised the Pope's situation. (He wrote against them the "Modern Jesuit.")

Count Balbo, in "The Hopes of Italy" (1844), pointed out to the Italians the faults which they must correct before they could attain independence.

The poet d'Azeglio, in "Recent Events in Romagna" (1846), recounts the struggles and persecutions of the Liberals in Romagna in 1845, and sets forth their grievances against the Church government as presented in the "Manifesto of the inhabitants of the States of the Church to the princes and peoples of Europe." While recognising the courage of the rebels, he re-

* The Sicilian massacres of 1837, during the cholera, were not political acts; the people believed themselves poisoned, and massacred all who were suspected. The government of Naples seized the opportunity to declare the Sicilians incapable of governing themselves, and revoked the ordinances of 1816, which reserved to them the civil and Church offices. Henceforth there was to be no distinction between Neapolitans and Sicilians.

proached them with forgetting their main object, the deliverance of their native land.

The strange part of it was that these three authors were Piedmontese, and all three designated their sovereign, the King of Sardinia, as the principal champion of independence.

Thus began the period called *Risorgimento* (resurrection). The idea of raising Italy again spread rapidly among cultivated men. It was more a common sentiment than a party. There was no organization, not even a precise object. They desired reforms, a liberal government, and the union of all Italians; but as they did not want a revolution to expropriate the princes who were opposed to a union, they could think of nothing but a federation between the sovereigns, and all did not agree about that. Should there be three kingdoms or only two? And what place should the Pope have? These aspirations were confused, but men were agreed on two points: 1. Italy must shake off the foreign yoke; 2. She was strong enough to effect her unity without aid. The motto was given by King Charles Albert: a minister asked him how Italy would carry out her plans, and he replied: *Italia fara da se* (Italy will do it alone).

Beginning with 1846, three sovereigns encouraged the national movement: the Pope, the Grand Duke of Tuscany, and the King of Sardinia. At the death of Gregory XVI. (1846) the conclave, which met at once without waiting for the foreign cardinals, rejected Cardinal Lambruschini, the candidate nominated by the Absolutist and Austrian party, and elected the candidate of the Roman party, Mastai, bishop of Imola, surnamed the Good, who took the title of Pius IX. Elected in opposition to Austria and supported by France, Pius IX. immediately passed as the liberal Pope who was to realize the national dream of Gioberti. He was adored by the Liberals, and the hymn "Long live Pius IX.!" became a national chant all over Italy.

Pius IX. granted his subjects several liberal reforms: amnesty for all prisoners condemned for political offences (July, 1846), opening of a reading room, and a milder censorship for the press (March, 1847), a *Consulta di Stato*, formed of laymen, one from each province, chosen by the government for two years (April, 1847), and then a national guard (July). Prosecutions at once began against the Sanfedists, who were accused of conspiring to massacre the Liberals; some of them were executed, others arrested, and the Sanfedist volunteers were disarmed. However, when he received the members of the *Consulta*, the Pope informed

them that he was resolved to preserve all his authority. But already a political club had been organized, the *People's Club*; the Roman people began to obey their local officers; a mob went to congratulate the Swiss consul on the defeat of the Sonderbund, crying: "Death to the Jesuits!" (November 30, 1847). Mazzini wrote the Pope to place himself at the head of the national movement.

The Grand Duke of Tuscany followed the example of the Pope. He was forced to it by an agitation which was revolutionary at Leghorn, the seaport and great trade centre of the country; liberal at Florence, the capital, and at Pisa, the University city. In May, 1847, Pisa and Leghorn made a celebration in honour of Pius IX. and against the Austrians and Jesuits. The Grand Duke granted the modification of the censorship of the press, then a *Consulta* like that of the Pope, then a civic guard. At Pisa and Leghorn tricolour flags were set up. The Duke of Lucca abdicated and ceded his states to Tuscany. They abolished the Tuscan institution of *Sbires*, secret agents of the police, without uniform and now become almost hereditary.

King Charles Albert of Sardinia had hesitated long. He had become suspected by both Absolutists and Liberals for his conduct in 1821, and had forced himself to reassure the European governments by maintaining absolute government, limiting himself to having the codes revised (1837, 1840) and appointing consultative councils in the provinces. He had laboured especially to re-enforce his army; keeping each soldier only two years in the army and eight years on leave, he increased his infantry to 22,800 men in time of peace, 61,400 in time of war. But he felt himself supervised by Austria, which had come to an understanding, it was said, with his own minister of police and had got a papal nuncio established at Turin; he dared not break with either his absolutist ministers or the Jesuits; the Liberals had nicknamed him *Re Tentenna*, the Hesitating King.

The *Risorgimento* movement at last gave him courage, in 1846, to enter into conflict with Austria on a question of customs duty. The Austrian party distributed pamphlets against him; in answer to these the Genoese made a great celebration for the fiftieth anniversary of the expulsion of the Austrians (December, 1846). The English government, in rivalry with Austria, hastened to send a special envoy to Charles Albert, promising support, and urged him to conclude a customs union with the Pope and Tuscany. The King still hesitated, in spite of the congress of nat-

uralists in 1847, now become a political assembly for the discussion of reforms; in spite of the anti-Austrian manifestations in Genoa and Turin. Finally he issued the reform laws which abolished privileged courts, deprived governors of police control, increased the powers of municipal councils, and modified the censorship. To this independence movement the Austrian government replied by establishing a garrison at Ferrara and making alliances with the Dukes of Modena (1846) and Parma (December, 1847).

The Revolutions of 1848.—The excitement was so intense that the Italians did not wait to follow the example of other nations.

Since the early part of January, 1848, there had been outbreaks in the Lombardo-Venetian kingdom. The inhabitants had never accepted foreign rule; they boycotted the Austrian garrisons, and the Italian ladies refused to meet the German officers. The Lombardo-Venetians complained of the Austrian censorship which forbade the publication of any political discussion, of the administration where native deputies had no influence, of the secret police which had spies in every commune, and, above all, of the Austrian financial system, the octroi of cities, the taxes on the sale of drinks, on markets and bakeries, and the tobacco monopoly. It was estimated that the Emperor drew from his Italian subjects a quarter of his whole revenue, while they did not form an eighth of the population of his empire.

To strike the government in its finances, Italian patriots decided to consume no more cigars. On Sunday, January 2, at Milan, anyone showing himself in the street with a cigar was insulted or else the cigar was knocked out of his mouth. Austrian soldiers walked about smoking ostentatiously and were stoned. The dragoons charged, and a few persons were killed. Like scenes occurred at Padua between students and soldiers.

The revolution began in Sicily. The Liberals, having vainly petitioned the King, posted a call to arms all about Palermo. The government arrested ten of the leaders. On the appointed day (January 12) the people assembled, a number of insurgents made barricades: the fighting was confused, with several days intervening, from January 12 to 27; the troops bombarded the city, then retired. The general committee, composed of men of the high nobility, distributed the ministries among themselves; there was no talk of dethroning the King, the insurgents asked for nothing but the re-establishment of the Sicilian Constitution of 1812.

In Naples the mob marched before the palace crying: "Long live the King and the constitution!" Ferdinand, hearing that he could not count on the army, promulgated a constitution (January 29) on the model of the French Charter. Then he formed a ministry under a formerly proscribed Muratist and Carbonaro, Bozzelli.

This revolution, the first of all the revolutions of 1848, aroused the Liberals all over Italy. In the Kingdom of Sardinia, the Genoese had begun by demanding the expulsion of the Jesuits and the creation of a national guard. The journalists of Turin decided to hold a meeting for the discussion of reforms. Cavour proposed to demand a constitution (January 6). After the revolution of Naples, the city council of Turin, composed mainly of nobles, voted a petition to ask for the constitution and the national guard. The King decided at last and granted the Constitutional Statute (February 8), which later became the Constitution of the Kingdom of Italy. In Tuscany the Grand Duke granted a constitution, equally modelled on the French *Charte*.

At Rome the Pope, when giving his blessing to a crowd assembled under his balcony (he was then living at the Quirinal), added: "I ask you to cease making certain demands contrary to the sanctity of the Church, which I neither can, nor ought, nor will admit." But he appointed three lay ministers and, as was done in the French Revolution, granted the prayers of his subjects and promulgated the *Fundamental Statute for the temporal government of the States of the Church* (March 14). There were two councils, one of 100 deputies elected by property owners, the other of peers appointed by the Pope, a lay State Council and a ministry. But the College of Cardinals remained the supreme power, charged with the rejection or approval of laws, and, in spite of the liberty of the press, the censorship of religious books continued.

In the Italian countries occupied by Austrians the revolution of '48 was the result of the revolution in Vienna (see chap. xiii.). The Austrian government, disorganized, threatened on all sides by national revolts, abandoned its Italian provinces. The Milanese revolted; the Austrian general-in-chief, Radetzky, fearing to have his communication cut off, retired with his army into the Quadrilateral, a sort of entrenched camp formed by four strongholds, between Lombardy and Venetia. The Lombards then formed a provisional government, which tried to organize an army. At Venice, a republican lawyer, Manin, was ap-

pointed president of the provisional government, and thus proclaimed the revolution: "Long live the Republic and Saint Mark!" The Austrians abandoned Modena, which had broken out in revolution, and Parma, where the Duke gave a constitution (March, 1848).

The Liberals of Piedmont wanted to seize this occasion to drive out the Austrians; Cavour wrote, on March 23, in the *Risorgimento*, a moderate newspaper: "We, people of cool reason, accustomed to listen to the commands of reason rather than to the emotions of the heart, we say aloud there is but one way open to the nation, the government, and the King: war, and immediate war." The King decided to mobilize the army and sent it into Lombardy. The armies of Tuscany, of the Pope, and of Naples set out to join the Piedmontese army.

Until now the revolution had been liberal, monarchical, and national. In the various states the people had hoisted the tri-colour flag, the symbol of Italian unity, and the princes had appeared disposed to unite against the foreigner.

Internal Discords.—There were two causes of weakness in this revolution. 1. The Italians had not sufficient military force to drive out the foreign power without help; the Sardinian army, the only one that was ready for war, consisted of only 60,000 men, two-thirds of whom were in the reserve. 2. They were not agreed on the form of government they wished to adopt; the Absolutists desired a return of the old government; the Liberals, after having worked together, split into two hostile parties, the constitutional monarchists and the radical republicans; each of the two had its own solution of the national problem. The Monarchist party desired to establish unity by a federation between the princes; its leaders were notable Liberals who relied upon the governments. The Republican party, directed by Mazzini and his friends, wished to convoke a general parliament to determine the fate of Italy; it was recruited among the people in the large cities, especially Genoa, Milan, Rome, Leghorn, and Naples, and looked for the support of the French Republicans.

The struggle between the three parties began. The Constitutionalists predominated in the north of Italy, the Republicans in the centre, and the Absolutists in the south. The south started the reaction. The Chamber which was elected in the Kingdom of Naples in accordance with the new constitution was composed of Liberal Constitutionalists; before it had time to meet the King took advantage of a Republican outbreak in Naples to

dissolve it (May 15); he then suppressed the daily papers and recalled the army which he had sent to the aid of the Piedmontese. The Calabrians revolted and were subdued. A new Chamber, elected by incomplete elections, came together in July; it expressed its regret at the recall of the troops, because "the resurrection of Naples cannot be accomplished without independence and the establishment of Italian nationality," and demanded the completion of the elections and the control of the budget. But the Absolutist ministry, encouraged by the Austrian victory, adjourned the Chamber (September 5) and suppressed the Liberal newspapers. They then sent the army to reconquer Sicily. The Sicilian Parliament, in session since March 25, had first demanded that Sicily should be united to Naples by a personal union only; then, on the refusal of the King, had declared the throne vacant and the dynasty excluded (April 13). But in the choice of the new King of Sicily they had hesitated between a Tuscan prince who was supported by the Pope, and a Piedmontese prince; they had chosen the Piedmontese, the Duke of Genoa, second son of King Charles Albert, but the King had refused (August). This had led to a real war. The Neapolitan army landed in Sicily, bombarded Messina, seized and plundered it (September, 1848). Ferdinand was nicknamed "Re Bomba" (King Bomba). The French and English governments imposed an armistice; the war stopped until March, 1849. In 1849 the Sicilian Parliament rejected Ferdinand's ultimatum, decreed that all citizens between 18 and 30 years of age should become soldiers, and gave the command to a Polish Republican, Mieroslawski; but he had almost no regular troops. The war was reduced to one battle in the streets of Catani; the Neapolitan soldiers dared not advance, and the barricade was forced by a Swiss regiment. The Liberal leaders left the country, and the revolutionary government resigned its powers into the hands of the municipal council of Palermo; the Sicilian cities surrendered. Ferdinand promised them a constitution, an amnesty, a viceroy, a national guard, and the recognition of the debt of the revolutionary government; but he kept none of his promises. Sicily found herself once more under an absolute government (May, 1849). In the Kingdom of Naples the Absolutist restoration was already accomplished; the King had dissolved the Chamber (March 13). Then began political prosecutions; of 114 deputies, two-thirds were condemned to death, to prison, or banishment. Gladstone, in the English Parliament,

accused the government of treating persons condemned for political action as criminals.

In the centre of Italy, the Republican party profited first by the indignation against the King of Naples. The Pope had refused the rôle of president of a federation of Italian princes and leader of the Democratic party. Already, in the allocution of April 29, 1848, he protested against the accusation of having been the cause of the Italian revolutions; he declared that he had always exhorted his subjects to obedience and had had no intention of declaring war upon Austria. He entered into conflict with his lay ministry, struck out from his speech at the opening of the Chambers a passage upon nationalities,* promulgated a press law drawn up by the Dominicans (June 4). He refused the request of the Chambers to separate the powers of head of the Church and of sovereign of the State and to declare his ministers responsible to the Chambers. He then formed a new ministry. Its head, Rossi, formerly ambassador to France, tried to resist at once the Republican party and the Church restoration party. The day of the reopening of the houses he was assassinated in Rome (November 5). The Republican party demanded a constituent assembly, the mob advanced on the Quirinal. The Pope sent word to the European ambassadors that he was yielding to violence, then he fled to the Kingdom of Naples (November 24), leaving his power in the hands of a number of prelates and conservative laymen; but these were not allowed to act. The Liberals then formed a provisional government, which tried to prevent the rupture; but the Pope threatened to excommunicate any who should take part in the election. The Constituent Assembly, elected in spite of this threat, declared the Pope stripped of his temporal power and proclaimed the Roman Republic (February 9, 1849). The government was placed in the hands of a triumvirate with Mazzini at the head. He invited all the Italians to elect deputies to a general Constituent Assembly to establish Italian unity.

In Tuscany the government had forbidden clubs and political meetings, but it could not carry out this order; at Leghorn the Republicans repulsed the soldiers (September 2), and their chief, the poet Guerazzi, now master of Leghorn, obliged the Duke to

* "God has here below, by differences of tongue, of soil, of races, and of customs, established nations that they might live their own lives in their own way . . . and God has given to Italy all these ineffaceable characteristics."

call him to the ministry. The Republican party, in the name of national sovereignty, demanded a constituent assembly elected by universal suffrage. The Chamber, elected by the property owners, frightened by the Republicans in the galleries, voted a constituent assembly (January, 1849). The Grand Duke fled. A band of Republicans invaded the Chamber and gave the government to a triumvirate (February 9); then, on the advice of Mazzini, they proclaimed the Republic.

In Lombardy the provisional government of liberal monarchists, in order to cut short the republican agitation which Mazzini had begun at Milan, had determined upon *fusion* with the Kingdom of Sardinia. That the Republicans' own principle might be applied, the decision was left to the sovereign people. The Lombards were called upon to pronounce by universal suffrage "if the annexation of Lombardy to constitutional Piedmont should take place at once or be postponed." There were 561,000 for immediate annexation against 681 opposed (May 28, 1848). In Venetia the fusion was voted by an assembly of notables, 127 against 6 (July 2). All northern Italy was thus united in a single constitutional kingdom.

The Reaction.—As in 1821 and 1831, foreign armies effected the restoration. The Austrian army, in a single combat (at Custoza, July 24), put to flight the Sardinian army, and reconquered all of Lombardy. Radetzky, invested with unlimited powers, levied a special tax on all who had taken part in the revolution and set up a military government. Venetia alone remained a republic, and the assembly gave the dictatorship to Manin under the form of a triumvirate (August 13, 1848).

The Kingdom of Sardinia had simply arranged an armistice with Austria; England and France offered their mediation, but they could not agree on the constitution to give Lombardy. In March, 1849, the King of Sardinia, supported by the Chamber, began the national war again; this was at the time when Austria was occupied with Hungary. The Sardinian army had been increased to 85,000 men, but they were untrained and demoralized. A single defeat (Novara, March 23) made resistance impossible; Charles Albert abdicated to facilitate peace. His son Victor Emmanuel secured peace by paying a war indemnity. Venice surrendered after a long siege (August 22). Lombardy remained until 1851 subject to summary jurisdiction (*Standrecht*). The Austrian general, Haynau, who had taken Brescia by storm, was nicknamed the "hyena of Brescia"; he was even reproached

with having had women beaten. The most horrible thing to Italians was the penalty of whipping, which the Austrians had retained for their soldiers and now applied to the Italians. The government granted an amnesty, but excepted from it 86 notables, and later sequestered the estates of Lombards who had fled to Piedmont.

The duchies of Modena and Parma, which had joined Piedmont, were occupied by Austrians. The re-established dukes restored their absolutist government, persecuted the Liberals and clerical partisans of national unity, and concluded a customs union with Austria.

In Tuscany the Liberals tried to drive out the Austrians by forming, at Florence, a provisional government, and recalling the Grand Duke; the Republican party kept only Leghorn. But the Austrian army occupied Tuscany and remained there until 1859, and the Grand Duke, under the pressure of the Austrian government, finally (1852) withdrew the Constitution of 1848 and revived censorship of the press. Tuscany was more oppressed than before the revolution.

Four Catholic powers, France, Spain, Austria, and Naples, offered the aid of their armies to the Pope against the Roman Republic. The Neapolitans, who approached from the south, were driven back by the Republican forces; Spain sent only two ships. The Austrians occupied only the northern part of the States of the Church, the Romagna, where they remained until 1850.

➤ It was the French expedition that undertook to win back the city of Rome. The head of the Republic (established in March), Mazzini, and the most popular general, Garibaldi, were both from northern Italy: Mazzini from Genoa, Garibaldi from Nice. An army of volunteers had been organized; those of Garibaldi wore red shirts (at first blue) and the Calabrian plumed hat; a committee on barricades had been appointed. The French government at first sent only a small army, hoping to enter Rome without a battle, with the aid of the Liberal Monarchists; their object was simply to re-establish the Pope and at the same time preserve the liberal institutions; they were counting on a Liberal proclamation from the Pope, which they did not get. The French army attempted a surprise, and was repulsed by the Romans.

The fate of Rome hung on the struggle between political parties in France; the President and the Catholic Right in the As-

sembly decided on the war in spite of the Republican party. The Roman expedition ended in the siege and capture of the city (June 30, 1849). The Pope granted an amnesty, but with 283 exceptions. He re-established the government of the Cardinals, and Cardinal Antonelli, now secretary of state, rejected the reforms proposed by France as contrary to the papal sovereignty. Nothing was done beyond creating a *consulta* of laymen appointed by the Pope and absolutely without power.

The Constitutional Kingdom of Sardinia (1849-58).—The revolution of 1848 had failed. Nothing remained of it with the people but memories, miseries, and deceptions; with the governments, an even greater contempt for the press, liberal ideas, and the bourgeoisie; deficit in the finances, foreign garrisons all over central Italy (the Austrians in the duchies and the Romagna, and the French in Rome). The national tricolour flag, once adopted by all the states, was abandoned. Italy found herself once more, as in 1848, parcelled out and dependent upon foreign powers.

One state alone avoided the restoration and issued transformed from the crisis. The Kingdom of Sardinia preserved the liberal Constitution of '48 and the national tricolour flag; it became the centre where Italian unity was prepared. It was a sufficiently commonplace state, with a population of less than 5,000,000, composed of four separate parts; the island of Sardinia, a malarial country, poor, mediæval, and without political life; the coast of Genoa, a country of sailors, newly admitted to the state, ill disposed toward the dynasty, and the centre of the democratic republican party; Savoy, a rural French district, controlled by the nobles and clergy; Piedmont, a country of rustics, without industrial activity, with a single large city, Turin, the residence of the court.

The society was aristocratic, with sharper class distinctions than in Italy. The nobles held aloof from the middle class; preserving the traditions of military life, they usually became officers. The peasants continued to obey the clergy. The bourgeoisie, mostly of slender wealth, remained dependent upon the government. These people spoke a dialect very different from literary Italian, Piedmontese, considered a patois; to other Italians, uncultivated, coarse, backward, and only half Italian. But they had a political advantage over all the other peoples of Italy: they possessed an independent national dynasty and an army that could fight.

Charles Albert of Sardinia had been hated by the Liberals; they could not forgive him for deserting them in 1821 and for having preserved the absolutist government; even in 1848 they remained hostile and even suspected him of treason. Now the advocates of unity were all Liberals; to make Piedmont the centre of the national movement, it must first be reconciled with liberal opinion. This was the work of Victor Emmanuel and Cavour.

At the time of the general reaction in 1849, Victor Emmanuel remained faithful to the liberal system. Austria offered to modify the conditions of peace if he would renounce the Constitutional Statute of 1848; he refused. He abandoned neither the national tricolour flag nor the liberty of the press, and he gathered Liberal fugitives from other countries. His kingdom became the sole liberal and national state in Italy.

The Constitutional Statute of ~~1848~~¹⁸⁴⁹ was a combination of the French Charte and the Belgian Constitution. It established a parliamentary mechanism composed of a ministry responsible to the Chambers, a Senate of life members appointed by the King in two special classes, and a Chamber of Deputies elected by the property owners. It was a more democratic *régime* than in France (the tax qualification for voting was 40 francs or 20 francs, according to the place), but less liberal than in Belgium. The Statute announced neither the sovereignty of the people nor personal rights; it was simply a proclaimed constitution, without procedure for revision; it did not recognise liberty of faith, but declared Catholicism the state religion; it granted no salary to deputies; it left room for doubt as to the extent of the ministerial responsibility.

In fact the system has worked after the model of the English Parliament; the Statute has been modified often (and more easily than a revisable constitution) by means of laws passed in the usual form; the King has taken only those ministers that are accepted by the majority in the House. But the mass of electors has remained docile to the government, dissolution being usually a sufficient means of securing a majority favourable to the ministry which the King supports. The King thus remains the arbiter between parties, the true director of political life. The system really is, under a parliamentary appearance, the personal government of the King, as in France under Louis Philippe.

During the war against Austria the electors, excited by the national movement, had returned a democratic majority which

had obliged the King to take a ministry under Gioberti and now aspired to secure unity by a federation of the Italian states. After the defeat of 1849, the Chamber was not willing to vote approval of the peace. Now the constitution demanded that the treaty with Austria should be ratified by the Chamber. There were three Chambers elected that year (January, dissolved March 30; July, dissolved November 20; and December). The King published an appeal to the voters and secured a Chamber which voted the peace by 112 votes against 17 (January, 1850).

Then, in order to apply the article of the Statute which declared the King to be the fountain of justice, it became necessary to abolish the Church Courts. The government, having failed in its attempt to have the Holy See abolish them by concordat, decided to have the Chambers vote the famous "Siccardi laws" (Siccardi was minister of justice), which suppressed the right of asylum in convents, the clerical privilege of not being amenable to lay justice, the penalties for labour on ordinary holy days, and forbade the acquisition of possessions in mortmain without the consent of the state. A rupture ensued between the government and the higher clergy; the Archbishop of Turin forbade obedience to these laws, and was condemned to a month's imprisonment. One of the ministers died without absolution and the clergy refused to bury him; his funeral was made the occasion of a demonstration.

This struggle made the final arrangement of parties. There was an extreme right, absolutist and opposed to the constitution, an extreme left, democratic (recruited mainly in Genoa) and hostile to the dynasty; between the two the great constitutional dynastic mass divided into two groups: the *right*, the Conservative party supporting the constitution, and the *left centre*, detached from the Democratic party and now become a part of the liberal and anti-clerical bourgeoisie.

Cavour's Policy.—In this constitutional government, where the King, first of all a hunter and an army officer, took little interest in politics, there was a minister, Cavour, who controlled the state. Benzo di Cavour was a gentleman who could hardly be called Italian; he was blonde, with a white skin, and spoke almost nothing but French and the Piedmontese patois. He had been first an artillery officer, but was discharged for having approved the revolution of 1830, and retired to his own estates; he then spent his time travelling in France, where he frequented Broglie's salon and adopted the liberal doctrines of the French bourgeoisie,

and in Germany, where he absorbed ideas of economic reforms. In 1847 he was one of the founders of the *Risorgimento* in Turin, a liberal monarchical paper. During the Revolution he struggled against the democratic party so violently as to make himself unpopular. But during this reaction he defended the constitution and the liberty of the press. In the discussion of Church laws, he broke loose from the Conservative party and began to form a *right centre*, which approached the left centre directed by Ratazzi. Cavour first entered the ministry in 1850 as a special minister (agriculture, commerce, marine) under Azeglio (Conservative). In 1852 he left the Conservatives and formed the Cavour-Ratazzi ministry, which had the support of the two centres and lasted until 1859.

Cavour henceforth laboured to prepare for the contest with Austria by increasing the country's forces and seeking foreign allies.

To increase the wealth of the country, he attempted by means of commercial treaties to revive Genoa's shipping trade, and to develop the exportation of agricultural produce. His economic reforms revived the struggle with the clergy. He proposed to place a tax on Church estates, to secularize the lands of worn-out orders, and to establish a Church treasury to equalize the salaries of priests. He did not touch the 41 bishoprics (1 for every 149,000 souls) nor the secular clergy; but his plan for suppressing convents was enough to stamp him as an enemy to the Church. The Pope threatened the government with excommunication; then, as Victor Emmanuel had within one month lost his mother, his wife, and his brother, the Pope sent him a letter representing these deaths as a warning from God. The King hesitated, but nevertheless sanctioned the law which suppressed 334 convents with 4280 monks and 1200 nuns; 264 remained. The army under the direction of La Marmora, was reorganized on the Prussian model.

For outside agitation Cavour placed himself in connection with the advocates of Italian unity. There were already in the kingdom many Italian refugees, mainly Lombards. Several of the Republicans of 1848, despairing of a union by republic, turned toward the House of Savoy. The most noted convert was Manin, the former dictator of Venice. He wrote publicly (in the *Siècle*, September 15, 1855) that his motto was "Independence and unity," and, addressing himself to the King of Sardinia: "Make Italy, and I and all other Republican patriots are for you

and with you; if not, not." Other patriots joined him. In August, 1857, they founded the *National Union*, a public society in Piedmont, a secret society in the absolutist states. It won support especially among cultivated city people, and especially in northern Italy and Sicily (the secretary was a Sicilian, La Farina *). The Union carried on its work by pacific propaganda and disapproved of conspiracies and insurrections. It was in conflict with the former Republican party, with Mazzini, who founded a secret society in Genoa against the monarchy and incited trouble in Genoa, Naples, and Leghorn. The Piedmont papers began to attack the Austrian government openly; a subscription was started in Italy to buy cannon for the fortress of Alexandria in Piedmont, another for a monument in honour of the Italian army.

Cavour did not believe, with the patriots of 1848, that Italy was strong enough to act alone; since he had become minister of foreign affairs he had been looking for alliances. He was a great admirer of the English Constitution, and did not forget the former friendly relations between Piedmont and England; but he needed an ally with a strong army. He early thought of Napoleon III. To please him, he had had voted, in spite of the left, the law forbidding insults to foreign sovereigns. In the Crimean war he allied Sardinia with France and England against Russia, although the Genoese thereby lost their trade with Odessa; he sent into the Crimea a Sardinian army at the expense of the state, refusing English subsidies. The kingdom did not draw any direct profit from this war, but it gave Cavour a chance to take part in the Congress of 1856. He took advantage of this opportunity to get Napoleon to ask him for a report on the condition of Italy, and to thank him immediately in the name of all the Italians. He took advantage of it at the end of the Congress to present a report on the agitation in the States of the Church caused by the Austrian occupation.

His success hung on the personal will of Napoleon. The latter had in his youth sworn to work for Italian unity. It seems as if he was prevailed on to act by Orsini's attempts at assassination, and especially by the letter which Orsini had written him, conjuring him to restore the freedom of Italy. He sent his physician

* La Farina tells that he was in secret communication with Cavour; they had interviews in the early morning, and Cavour said to him: "Do what you can. Before the world I shall deny you as Peter denied the Saviour."

to invite Cavour to a personal interview at Plombières. At this interview an understanding was completed. It was a bargain: Napoleon promised to deliver the whole Lombardo-Venetian kingdom as far as the Adriatic; Cavour, in return, promised him Savoy and Nice.

Formation of the Kingdom of Italy (1859-60).—The union of Italy was accomplished by all the Italian advocates of unity, royalists and republicans, working in harmony with the Piedmontese government, aided by a great European power, first France, then Prussia. The process occupied eleven years and was made in five successive annexations: Lombardy, 1859; Tuscany, Modena and Parma, Romagna, January, 1860; Kingdom of Naples, the Marches, and Umbria, at the end of 1860; Venetia, 1866; Rome, 1870. The first three operations formed a continuous series which ended in the creation of the Kingdom of Italy.

War against Austria had been decided upon at Plombières; but it was necessary to await a cause for declaring it; England, which wished peace, proposed a congress; Napoleon consented to it. Cavour became desperate and already talked of blowing out his brains. But Austria, instead of agreeing to the congress, sent an ultimatum to Sardinia. War was declared.

This was not a war between states, but between parties. Austria represented absolute government, Church domination, and temporal power of the Pope; the conservative parties and the clergy all over Europe prayed for her success in the *Revolution* (they combined under this name all the constitutional and national attempts); even in France the ministers and the *salons* disapproved of the war. The Sardinian government represented national unity and liberal government; it had on its side all Italian patriots, Free Masons, and even Republicans, and in Europe all liberal democratic anti-clerical parties. To leave the King master, the Chamber of Sardinia conferred on him the dictatorship. The *National Union* declared itself dissolved; there were neither clubs nor newspapers. Garibaldi with his volunteers attacked the Austrian flank, in conjunction with the regular army. After the battle of Magenta the Austrians evacuated the whole of Lombardy; when coming back to take it again they were stopped at Solferino. But the "Quadrilateral" covered Venetia; Napoleon, seeing his army hard pressed and threatened by Prussia, which was mobilizing her troops, decided to conclude peace. Austria gave up only Lombardy, which was annexed to the

Kingdom of Sardinia without a plebiscite, as if it had never ceased to be a part of it since 1848. It was a cruel deception for the Italians; they reproached Napoleon with having broken the compact made at Plombières (Italy to be "freed as far as the Adriatic"). Cavour first refused peace; then, in despair, resigned.

But during the war Victor Emmanuel had called the Italians to arms. At his call, the advocates of unity had, immediately after the departure of the Austrian soldiers, formed provisional governments in the three duchies of central Italy and in the pontifical provinces farthest from Rome, the Legations (Romagna). The movement had been arranged beforehand with the Sardinian government; these provisional governments gave the power to a dictator, a member of the *National Union*, sometimes a Sardinian office-holder. In Tuscany the two parties, democratic and aristocratic, united and demanded the abdication of the Grand Duke and war with Austria; the Grand Duke refused and went away. A provisional government was formed immediately (April 27), and offered the dictatorship to Victor Emmanuel; the King accepted only the military management, but sent an agent to whom the government was intrusted. When the war was over, the Sardinian agent went home; the *Consulta* convoked an assembly of deputies who voted the expulsion of the dynasty and annexation to Sardinia (August, 1859). The dictators of Modena and Parma had the inhabitants vote for annexation to Piedmont: at Modena by 90,000 votes, at Parma by 63,000 (August, 1859). In the Romagna they elected a constitutional convention, which declared unanimously, in the name of the people, "that they did not want the temporal government of the Pope," then "that they did want annexation to the Kingdom of Sardinia" (September, 1859).

It was harder to make the European powers accept this "revolution," and they were really the arbiters of the fate of Italy. Napoleon and the Emperor of Austria had decided together that central Italy should remain divided into small states, united simply in a confederation; it was the tradition of French policy to keep Italy divided up like Germany; in Tuscany, Napoleon would have liked to establish his cousin Jerome. Besides, the Pope protested against the revolution in the Romagna, and the French government did not dare act against the Pope. For eight months central Italy lived in uncertainty, at the mercy of diplomatic intrigues. Meanwhile, Modena, Parma, and the Romagna adopted the constitution of Sardinia, suppressed the customs

duties on the frontiers toward Sardinia, handed over the post-offices to Sardinian employees, and formed a union under the name of the *royal provinces of Emilia*. They then formed a military league with Tuscany.

The Italians were planning now to bring Napoleon face to face with an accomplished fact; they kept him from interfering by treating him as a liberator, and imploring his aid in the name of his own principles, nationality and the right of universal suffrage. Napoleon wanted to settle matters through a congress. The congress was called, but never met, as the Pope would not consent to it. In Piedmont the Republican party, irritated with these delays, wished to begin fighting again; they founded a society, the *Nazione Armata*, which should revolutionize Italy. The coalition of the centres, which had been governing since 1852, broke up; the right centre and the King were unwilling to act against Napoleon. Ratazzi resigned; Cavour took the ministry (January 20, 1860) and persuaded Napoleon to permit the annexation of central Italy, for the price set at Plombières: Savoy and the county of Nice. They avoided the formality of a treaty of cession; all these annexations were simply put to a vote by universal suffrage (March, 1860) and carried almost unanimously. The new provinces then elected their delegates to the Chamber at Turin, which took the name of the *National Parliament*.

The royalists had gained central Italy, the republicans assumed control of the south.

The government of Naples was defended mainly by Swiss regiments. Now, in 1859, Perugia had revolted against the Pope, and had been taken by a Swiss regiment; the irritation of the patriots had therefore been directed against the Swiss mercenaries established in Italian cities, which, menaced in their commerce, remonstrated with the Swiss federal government. The Swiss government ordered the withdrawal of the Swiss national emblems from the flags of the mercenaries. The Swiss regiments in the service of Naples mutinied, refusing to serve under any other flag, and the majority of the soldiers withdrew. So the King of Naples was left with almost none but Neapolitan soldiers, who had little interest in defending him. Victor Emmanuel offered him an alliance and tried to make him grant a constitution (1859); Ferdinand refused (March, 1860). Revolutionary committees were formed in Sicily, and insurrection began, supported by the Italians of the north.

Garibaldi, secretly aided by the Sardinian government,* landed in Sicily with a thousand volunteers, mainly Lombards (the famous Marsala Thousand). A short combat (Calatafimi, May 17), a night march by the Garibaldians on Palermo (May 26), an armistice (May 30), and the Neapolitan army retired in disorder. Garibaldi, although master of Sicily, prepared to return to the continent. Ferdinand asked aid of Napoleon, who replied: "The Italians are shrewd, they know very well that after having shed the blood of my children in the cause of their nationality, I can never fire a cannon in opposition to it." Then Ferdinand determined to re-establish the Constitution of '48 and the tricolour flag, to take a liberal ministry and convoke the Chambers. But he no longer inspired confidence. He felt himself abandoned, and when Garibaldi's army invaded the Kingdom of Naples, he dared not resist, and fled to Gaeta. He wanted to take his fleet, but the Neapolitan officers had had their boilers emptied and their helms put out of order, so the fleet remained. Garibaldi was received in triumph at Naples. There remained now to the King but two places of refuge, Capua and Gaeta, and these were taken later.

The Garibaldians next invaded the States of the Church. The Pope, to replace his Swiss mercenaries, had enrolled a small army of volunteers (about 20,000 men), mainly foreigners—Austrians, Irish, Belgians, and French, under a French general, Lamoricière; in addition to these, Rome had, since 1849, retained its French garrison. The war began between the Italian Republicans and the Pope's Catholic army. Cavour determined to in-

*Garibaldi, after the war, had been appointed general in Tuscany, then charged by Victor Emmanuel with the formation of the national guard in Lombardy. Dissatisfied with the Sardinian government, which had prevented him while in Tuscany from attacking the States of the Church (November, 1859); dissatisfied with the pacific policy of the *National Union* (he resigned his office of honorary president in December, 1859); still more dissatisfied with the cession of Nice, his native home, he had resigned. It was said that he was urged against Sicily by Cavour, who had written to him: "Nice or Sicily." The letter is disputed. It was said that the Sardinian government sent to Garibaldi the guns from the arsenal of Modena, furnished him money, and ordered the governor of Genoa to close his eyes to his preparations. When the expedition was fairly started, Cavour wrote officially to the European powers, expressing his regret, but Admiral Persano, commander of the fleet, says that he received from Cavour a note to this effect: "Try to place yourself between Garibaldi and the Neapolitan cruisers; I hope you understand me." Persano is said to have replied: "My lord, I believe I do understand you. If there is need, send me to the fortress prison of Fenestrella."

terfere and called upon the pontifical government to disband its foreign soldiers, "who are an insult to national feeling and prevent the people from expressing their wishes." To Napoleon he wrote: "We are forced to take action." Napoleon washed his hands of the whole affair.* The Piedmontese army rapidly occupied the provinces of the Marches and Umbria. The Pope's little army, while retreating to Ancona, was checked and scattered (Castelfidardo, September 18); the rest were taken at Ancona. The agents of the Sardinian government had a vote taken by universal suffrage on the question of annexation to the constitutional monarchy of Victor Emmanuel (November, 1860). The vote was almost unanimous in favour of the annexation.

In the country conquered by the Republicans there was a heavy struggle (August-October, 1860). Garibaldi, "dictator of Sicily" and later "dictator of the two Sicilies," obeyed the Republican party, under the direction of the Sicilian, Crispi; he refused annexation to the Kingdom of Italy. The liberal monarchists, directed by the pro-dictators of Sicily and Naples (Depretis, Pallavicino), insisted upon annexation. The people of Naples then made their demonstration of "yes's." They showed their wishes by placing in their hats, their windows, and their doors a paper bearing the word *si* (yes). Garibaldi at last decided to put the question of annexation to vote. It was voted in Naples by 1,302,074 votes against 10,132; in Sicily by 432,053 votes against 667.

The Parliament, composed of 413 deputies and 214 senators, proclaimed Victor Emmanuel King of Italy, "King by the grace of God and by act of the people" (February-March, 1861). His kingdom had increased from 5,000,000 to 22,000,000 souls.

The Roman Question (1860-66).—The Kingdom of Italy still lacked Venetia and the province of Rome. The Italians were not strong enough to take Venetia from the Austrians, nor Rome from the defenders of the Pope. The process of union stopped, and Italian politics became absorbed with the *Roman question*.

This question had been before them since 1859, when the Pope's subjects in the Romagna had rejected the temporal power. What should be the fate of the States of the Church? Four parties were organized, each with a solution.

* Two messengers are said to have carried a letter from Victor Emmanuel to Napoleon, at Chambéry; according to one of them, Cialdini, Napoleon replied: "Good luck and act promptly." This reply has taken the legendary form: "Act, but act quickly."

1. The Pope and his minister Antonelli declared themselves unable to renounce the temporal power over any of the States of the Church; the Pope regarded himself as bound by his oath at accession to hand them over intact to his successor. He therefore excommunicated his rebellious subjects, also the Sardinian King and government for having agreed to the annexation. He refused to recognise the Kingdom of Italy, "a creation of revolution." His general, Lamoricière, said to his soldiers: "Europe is threatened to-day by revolution as she once was by Islam, and to-day as then the cause of the papacy and of civilization is that of the liberty of the world." He wrote: "Everywhere that revolution shows the tip of its ear or its nose, it must be struck down like a mad dog."

2. The Italian Republican party was really preparing for revolution; Garibaldi and Mazzini demanded open war to deliver the papal subjects from the "tyranny of priests." They wished to employ volunteers as they had done against the King of Naples.

Between these two extreme parties, pontifical restoration and Republican revolution, two parties were seeking an intermediate solution.

3. Napoleon III. had to take care not to irritate the Catholic party too much, as it was very powerful in France; he would have preferred not to touch the temporal power; he asked only a constitution given by the Pope as in 1848. After the insurrection in the Romagna, he advised the Pope to sacrifice a part of the States of the Church in order to retain the rest. The anonymous pamphlet on "The Pope and the Congress," which he got published in December, 1859, showed that restoration in the Romagna was out of the question: the Pope needs a temporal power in order to exercise his spiritual power freely, but he cannot govern a state of any size; the Catholic powers should guarantee him only Rome and the patrimony of St. Peter. The Pope denounced this pamphlet as "a monument of hypocrisy" and refused to take part in the congress if the suggestion were not discountenanced. Napoleon also let the Pope lose the Marches and Umbria, and in a new pamphlet had it said that Italy and the Pope must eventually reconcile themselves; meanwhile, he maintained the French garrison in Rome to preserve the temporal power in the interests of religion.

4. The Italian government found itself in a false position, not wishing to break with the Pope, the head of the Catholics, not being able to encourage the revolutionists openly for fear of

Europe, nor to attack Rome for fear of France, and not daring either to fight the revolutionists or to abandon Rome for fear of popular opinion at home. The King was a good Catholic and continued to address the Pope in respectful terms. Cavour declared publicly before the Chamber that the question must be left in suspense (March 28, 1861): "Rome must be the capital of Italy. Without Rome for her capital Italy cannot be definitely constituted." But he added that two conditions were necessary: harmony with France and the maintenance of the Pope's spiritual sovereignty. His motto was: "A free Church in a free state," that is to say, the clergy governing the faithful in spiritual affairs without intervention from the state. The Chamber passed a resolution to the same effect.

Then began a period of waiting and senseless intrigue. The Catholic party did not resign itself to the spoliation of the Pope, nor did the national parties give up hope of Rome. But the decision depended upon the will of foreign powers, especially France. Garibaldi tried to repeat his expedition of 1860; the Ratazzi ministry let him land in Sicily, but afterward stopped him at Aspromonte in Calabria; they then declared themselves unable to answer for order in Italy if the government was hindered from giving the nation its capital (1862). But the result was to drive Napoleon to the side of the Pope's party, and to compel the Ratazzi ministry to resign.

The Italian government then decided to postpone the solution; it offered Napoleon to transfer its capital to Florence and to take the rôle of defender of the Pope; this was Cavour's plan. Napoleon agreed to it in order to get rid of the conflicts between his French generals and the court of Rome. This had as outcome the *September Convention* of 1864. Italy promised to stop her attacks on the Pope's territory, to defend it from all outside attacks, and to let the Pope enroll an army of volunteers. France promised to withdraw her troops in two years. The Italian government left Turin and transferred itself to Florence; the French army finally evacuated Rome in 1866. The solution of the Roman question was postponed.

Annexation of Venetia and Rome (1866-70).—As usual, the solution came from outside. The Prussian government needed Italy to help it in its war against Austria. It had been making overtures since 1862; but the two governments lacked confidence in one another, each suspecting that the other wanted to make use of its help to secure more favourable conditions from Austria.

Italy hoped to gain Venetia without fighting, in return for a money compensation, or with Napoleon's aid, in exchange for Roumania. At last Prussia and Italy concluded, with Napoleon's consent, an offensive and defensive alliance for three months only (April, 1866). The Italian army attacked the Quadrilateral and was stopped at Custozza. It had begun once more to invade Venetia, when the Italian fleet was half destroyed at Lissa. It was the Prussians' victory at Sadowa that decided Austria in favour of peace. - She accepted Napoleon's mediation, granting him Venetia, which he gave to Italy, on condition that the annexation was approved by universal suffrage. (The vote was carried almost unanimously.)

Rome now remained defended only by the Papal volunteers. Garibaldi, for the third time, taking advantage of a Ratazzi ministry, attacked the Roman territory. The Italian government had vainly implored Napoleon to intrust to it alone the protection of the Pope. Napoleon had little faith in Italian intervention, and sent a French expedition which accompanied the papal troops against Garibaldi. The famous battle of Mentana ensued; the Garibaldians were killed or taken prisoners under the very eyes of the Italian army, which had arrived on papal territory and was obliged to remain neutral (November 3, 1867). The French used the new Chassepot gun for the first time, and the French general telegraphed: "The Chassepots have worked splendidly." This message rankled in Italian minds as an insult. In Paris, the head of the ministry, Rouher, formally declared to the Chamber: "Italy will not enter Rome. No, never!" A French garrison was left in Rome (December 5). The Pope then felt safe in summoning the ecumenical council of the Vatican for December, 1869.

Once more the solution came from abroad. The war between France and Germany robbed the Pope of his defender. After the first French defeats, the Emperor's government recalled the French troops from Rome (August, 1870). After Sedan, the Italian army invaded the papal territory and arrived before Rome. Pius IX. declared that he would yield only to force, and waited until a breach was made in the wall before he ordered his troops to retire (September 20). The Italians occupied Rome without a battle. The question of annexation to the Kingdom of Italy was submitted to universal suffrage, and was voted by 130,000 against 1500.

The Kingdom of Italy was finally constituted under the na-

ional dynasty of Piedmont, through the agreement of the two national parties, republicans and constitutionalists, but chiefly through the aid of two foreign powers, France and Prussia.

Formation of Parties and Internal Difficulties (1861-70).—The sudden creation of the Kingdom of Italy had upset the conditions of public life. The constitution of the Kingdom of Sardinia having been extended to the new provinces, it was necessary to adjust anew the administrative system, the relations with the Church, the finances, and the army, and new parties had formed.

The extreme parties, absolutist and republican, had been greatly weakened by the success of the constitutional monarchy; they had almost no representation in the Chamber. The Pope had given the Catholics the watchword *Neither electors nor members*, and so the Catholic party had almost disappeared. The republicans had taken the form of a radical party with a small membership. The Chamber was therefore composed almost entirely of the two constitutional parties, the right (Minghetti and Ricasoli) and left centre (Ratazzi). Cavour had died in 1861.

The ministry alternated between these two parties, chiefly for reasons of foreign policy. Ratazzi, who had succeeded to the ministry as Napoleon's friend (1862), fell before the protestations of the French government after Aspromonte; he foundered on the same rock again in 1867, after Mentana.

The groups formed chiefly on local lines. The Piedmontese (the former kingdom), supported by the deputies of central Italy, were in control the greater part of the time; the deputies from the south, with a part of the Lombards, opposed them—usually in the guise of a radical party.

The first matter taken up was that of organizing the administration. Minghetti proposed to give a degree of autonomy to the provinces. The great majority preferred the centralizing system used in France, with prefects and mayors appointed by the central government; they divided the kingdom into 59 provinces, corresponding not to the old historic provinces, but to departments.* They hoped thus to strengthen the unity which was threatened by the particularist spirit. They feared especially to arouse a feeling of jealousy in other cities in choosing one to be the capital of a whole province.

In the Kingdom of Naples, the brigands and idle mountaineers, acting in the name of King Ferdinand and aided by

* There are 69 since the annexation of Rome and Venetia; they bear the names of cities.

the absolutists, terrorized the inhabitants, forbade them to pay taxes, and kidnapped or murdered all liberals. The Italian army for several years waged a veritable war against them in the mountain districts. But it seems that they did not succeed in destroying either the *Camorra* in Naples or the *Mafia* in Sicily, secret societies of brigands who preyed on the inhabitants and made them pay tribute under pain of robbery or assassination.

Church affairs were in an inextricable tangle. The right, which ordinarily was in control, was formed of Catholic liberals, faithful to Cavour's program: "A free Church in a free state." They freely renounced the powers of the former governments over the bishops in Church matters, and would even leave the Pope the right of naming the bishops. They wanted an understanding with the Holy See to reorganize the Church in the new provinces where the clergy were too numerous. But the Pope, refusing to recognise the new kingdom, made it impossible to conclude a new regulation and even to transact ordinary affairs; the bishoprics therefore remained vacant, the Pope appointing bishops who refused to be installed by the government. They had hoped to settle all this in 1866; the negotiation failed because the Pope would not recognise any right of the state, and the question of the appointment of bishops remained unsettled.

The government then resigned itself to carrying on the work of reform alone; it did not interfere with the bishops, but adopted a fiscal measure. It suppressed the convents and livings which, having no cure of souls, were regarded as useless. It declared their lands state property. The seminaries were reduced from 288 to 21 (1867). The secularized lands were sold for the benefit of the state, which in exchange charged itself with the support of the clergy.

The Italian army was still the former Piedmontese army, with Italian recruits added to it. The same system was retained as to active army and reserve. Local military bodies, each recruited in its own region, were objected to as dangerous to unity. The army was regarded as a school for national sentiment where soldiers of all provinces must learn to regard each other as fellow-countrymen; it was also a primary school for raw recruits who enlisted without knowing how to read (64 per cent. in 1866).

Of these difficulties the greatest was the organization of the finances. The army, maintained at a high effective force to be always ready for the next war, and a newly created navy, entailed an expenditure disproportionate to the wealth of the coun-

try. The following table, taken from a report published in 1863,* shows the difference between the budgets of the separate states in 1859 and the budget of the united kingdom in 1863:

	Receipts.	Deficit.	Debt.
1859	575,000,000fr.	50,000,000fr.	2,000,000,000fr.
1863	900,000,000	350,000,000	4,000,000,000

In 1864 the treasury was empty, and the city of Brescia set the patriotic example of paying its taxes in advance. Half of the total receipts was absorbed by the interest on the debt; the annual deficit was covered only by new loans.

The Consorteria (1861-76).—For fifteen years (1861-76) Italy's domestic policy was subordinated to military and economic necessities. This was the period of business ministries, without distinct political character. The chief ministers were from the constitutional right, Italians of the north and centre: Minghetti was a Piedmontese, Sella a Lombard, Ricasoli a Tuscan, Fanti a native of Romagna. They were called the *Consorteria* (club). In various combinations they held the ministry most of the time; Ratazzi twice succeeded in dislodging them by forming a coalition of the left centre, the radicals and the discontented Piedmontese, but his ministries were short (March-October, 1862; April-October, 1867). The Piedmontese were displeased at losing the capital, transferred from Turin to Florence, and for several years formed a party (the *permanents*), but in 1869 they made a reconciliation with a ministry of the right (Menabrea-Minghetti).

The Consorteria governed during the critical period of the deficit and the sharp conflict with the Pope. Finally Sella, minister of finance, persuaded the Chamber to adopt an heroic measure. The deficit had reached 630,000,000.†

In 1868 they re-established the grist tax, which had been abolished in 1859 as too unpopular. They also created new taxes to the amount of about 150,000,000. The sale of secularized lands procured over 500,000,000 (from 1868 to 1876). In 1873 they made banknotes legal tender.

* Plebano and Musso, "The Finances of the Kingdom of Italy," 1863. These figures are only approximate.

† According to Sella's calculations, the total expenditure from 1861 to 1870 had been 10,499,000,000; the receipts 10,054,000,000, of which 3,607,000,000 were special receipts, mainly loans. To borrow 2,691,000,000 the state had contracted a nominal debt of 3,852,000,000, and paid 1,219,000,000 as interest.

The Consorteria had also the task of adjusting relations with the Pope after the taking of Rome. The Italian government was transferred to Rome, as the definite capital of the kingdom; the King established himself in the Quirinal Palace. The Pope's situation was settled by the *law of guarantees* (1871). The Pope, recognised as an independent sovereign, preserved, in his Palace of the Vatican, his sovereign powers, right to receive diplomatic agents, jurisdiction, guard, and archives; Italy engaged to grant him a civil list of three and a quarter millions. In exchange for his temporal power, the state gave up to him its powers over the Italian clergy, recognised his right to appoint the bishops, abolished the bishops' oath to the King, the *placet* and the *exequatur*. But Pius IX. nevertheless excommunicated the invaders, and declared himself "morally a prisoner," making a rule for himself never to leave the Vatican again; he refused to enter into relations with the Italian government, and even to receive the civil list. The ministry, which had never ceased to avow its respect for the Holy Father, found itself, face to face with Europe and the Italians, in a very delicate situation.

As the Pope persisted in his refusal to recognise the Kingdom of Italy, the occupation of Rome remained an actual possession, although not recognised by the Catholics and exposed to the chance of a restoration. The Catholic party, especially in France, protested against the captivity of the Holy Father and talked of re-establishing the temporal power by force of arms, as in 1849. From the time that the Catholic monarchists assumed control in France in 1873 until the check of May 16 (1877), the Italian government thought itself threatened with a French expedition. Now the "Consorteria" had been the French party; it had made the alliance with Napoleon and had been attacked by the republicans and radicals; in 1870, its sympathies were with France. In 1871, relations with the French government became so cool that the ministry decided to increase the army to resist, as it said, "the clerical party, which might make itself seem the national party in other countries."

The Pope's attitude made it impossible to settle by a concordat the question of the Roman convents, or to make regular provision for the bishoprics which had become vacant (89 in 1871). The government secularized the Roman convents by a law, and their possessions were turned over to the treasury (1873). It proposed a law to make civil marriage compulsory (1873), but postponed the discussion in order not to aggravate the situation.

The Pope continued to fill vacant bishoprics, and the bishops entered upon their office without asking the consent of the government, confining themselves to publishing the bull of nomination in the sacristy; and the government contented itself with this. The Catholic party tried to regain its position in political life; a congress of Catholic societies (1874) determined to vote everywhere at the communal elections in order to establish municipalities favourable to Christian schools; the Catholics had not yet voted except at Naples (1872); they failed at first, but succeeded in a number of cities in 1875.

It was also a ministry of the right that carried the law for compulsory military service like that of Prussia, with a one-year volunteer system.

The policy of the ministry of the right remained defensive; Minghetti summed up his program in two points: balanced budget, independent Church.

Accession of the Left (1876).—Little by little the proportion of parties in the Chamber had changed. The left was growing. This party, called *radical*, had allied itself to royalty; at the twenty-fifth anniversary of the King's accession (1874) the party declared that "so far as attachment to the King and the House of Savoy are concerned, the Left is not a hair's breadth behind the Right." At the election of 1874 there were returned only 288 members for the government and 220 for the opposition. For the first time party divisions were entirely geographical: northern Italy voted for the right and the ministry, southern Italy for the left.

The Tuscans, who had vainly borne the expense of installing the government in Florence, where it had remained only six years, formed a party and joined the left; the ministry was put in minority on the grist tax by a vote of 242 against 181. A Sicilian, Depretis, formerly Garibaldi's agent, formed the first ministry of the left, in which southern Italians predominated (March, 1876). It changed a large number of prefects, then obtained a dissolution. The Chamber was in large part new men; only 332 of the 508 deputies retained their seats. Sicily and Naples, instead of 149 deputies of the Left against 45 of the Right, returned 184 of the Left. There were 385 members for the government, 94 for the Right, and 20 Republicans. Since 1876 the Right, properly speaking, has never regained the majority.

To understand the political contests of the last twenty years

in Italy, it is necessary to study the practical conditions of electoral and parliamentary life. Under the Constitution of 1848 the right of voting had been confined to property owners paying a tax of 40 francs; now in the greater part of Italy the land belonged to large landholders, and the peasants were only tenants; the number of voters scarcely exceeded 600,000; even after the reform of 1882 it did not exceed 2,000,000. Even in this restricted voting body, the great majority remained indifferent to politics; the number of votes is rarely a half of the registered names, and, further, among the voters a large proportion vote for the candidate supported by the administration. The ministry is almost sure of getting a majority of its candidates elected.

The Chamber itself has little political activity. The deputies receive no pay, and so cannot afford to stay at their own expense all through the session; so, many are absent or come only to vote. Since the capital has been at Rome, the Italians of the north, being the farthest from the centre (and perhaps the most occupied with private business), have left the Chamber in the hands of Sicilian and Neapolitan deputies. The direction of Italy has changed hands, passing from the people of the north to those of the south. Now, the north alone had the habits of regular administration and liberal monarchy; the south, where political interest had always taken the form of revolution, had no strength of attachment either to the constitution or to the monarchy, which had both come from the north; it has furnished the great mass and all the chiefs of the radical members. Thus was established the domination of both the south and the radical party. The Catholics, by obeying the order of the Holy See to abstain from the parliamentary elections, have diminished the number of Conservative voters and weakened the Right in the same degree.

The Left, which had attained power through the personal influence of the voters of southern Italy and the abstention of the Catholics, supported a democratic platform, hostile to the Church: extension of the right of voting, abolition of the grist tax, compulsory primary instruction, administrative and judicial reforms, "liberty of conscience," or measures against the abuse of clerical influence, state administration of Church revenues. But the party, united in the struggle for power, divided on the attainment of it; it broke into personal groups supporting rival chiefs.

The division first took the form of a difference in policy: the

ministry of March 25, 1876, headed by a former ally of Ratazzi, the Sicilian Depretis, came forward with a moderate left program; it postponed the abolition of the grist tax, justifying this by the deficit; it even forbade a public meeting on the question. One of the Radical leaders who had sustained the ministry, Cairoli, made a coalition with the remaining leaders of the opposition and joined the Right. The ministry broke up, and two months after the death of Victor Emmanuel (January 9, 1878) was formed the Cairoli ministry (March 23), which took for its program the diminution of the taxes. The budget, upset by this reform, remained at first in deficit. But the years of prosperity which followed produced equilibrium and even a small excess about 1889.

The electoral reform, so long under discussion, ended in the law of 1882. The left did not want universal suffrage, which would have put the votes of the ignorant and wretched peasants at the service of the landowners. They limited themselves to lowering the voting qualification, based on property, to the payment of about four dollars in taxes or the possession of a hundred-dollar farm. They added an educational qualification, conferring the right of voting on all men of full age who gave evidence of having completed the prescribed course of the primary schools. This reform carried the number of voters from 627,000 to 2,048,000. Of these 710,000 get the right in virtue of paying taxes, and 1,338,000 through the educational qualification. The rearrangement of electoral districts established 135 divisions of the kingdom, in each of which two or more deputies were to be elected. The whole number assigned to any division had to be chosen by general ticket (*scrutin de liste*). In any division having five or more, to elect, the individual voter could only vote for four. The whole system was, however, abandoned in 1891, and single-member district substituted.

The Triple Alliance and Personal Rivalries.—Since the Left attained power, Italy's political history has been a series of personal contests, parliamentary intrigues, secret negotiations, coalitions and ruptures between parties, and sudden transfers of power. The real reasons for these actions are hard for a foreigner to penetrate, and even the Italians are not agreed on a true interpretation. But the salient features of the period are the personal rivalries and the predominance of foreign policy.

The Left divided itself into groups of members, each attached to a chief by friendship or business ties. The great leaders were

two Sicilians: Depretis, formerly pro-dictator in 1860; Crispi, formerly Garibaldi's minister, a Republican, "rallied" to the monarchy; and three Neapolitans, Cairoli, Nicotera, Zanardelli. Being unable to agree so far as to occupy the ministry at the same time, they contended for the possession of it. The groups of the chiefs in power formed the ministerial party, the groups of the chiefs shut out from the ministry formed the opposition. The ministry was constituted only by the coalition of several leaders, and it had to be maintained against men of their own party in opposition. The Right either joined the opposition Left to defeat the ministry, or joined a minority of the Left in supporting a ministry distasteful to the majority of the Left. The ministers could therefore depend only on passing alliances between the rival groups; the combinations varied with the personal relations of the chiefs, and sometimes they were overturned by accidents which compromised one of these (Nicotera in 1877, after the revelation of his past; Crispi, 1878, after an accusation of bigamy).

~~All these rivalries increased the King's personal influence; being empowered to decide between the rivals, he succeeded in choosing his ministers according to his personal preferences, at the same time preserving the outward form of the parliamentary system. It seems that he chose them according to the demands of his foreign policy; so that domestic policy must still, as before the union, be controlled by relations with foreign powers.~~

The French alliance party had been the Right, the northern Italians, whom the French had delivered from Austria; even to-day Milan remains the centre of opinion favourable to France. The Left, Sicilians, Neapolitans, and Romans, was the natural enemy of Catholic France, which had defended the Pope against the Kingdom of Italy. It tended therefore to look toward Germany. The Left attained power at the same time that the French Catholic party began its campaign to re-establish the temporal power (1877); this decided the Italian government to cease its isolation policy and to seek terms of alliance with Germany (1878).

Germany, however, had allied itself with Austria, the old enemy of the Italian Republicans; and France, after the victory of the Republican party, ceased to threaten Rome. The Italian government wavered several years between the German states and France.

The Depretis ministry had favoured Germany, Cairoli pre-

ferred France. To meet the Depretis-Nicotera-Crispi coalition Cairoli leaned at once on the two extremes, the Right and the Republicans; he granted complete freedom of speech and of public meeting, declaring that the monarchy had nothing to fear from liberty.

The Republican party had but a small membership in the Chamber, but was very active in the large cities (especially Milan and Rome); it adopted the policy of the Radicals, and began to agitate in the name of national sentiment. A number of patriots declared Italy incomplete, and demanded the restoration of provinces speaking the Italian language but occupied by foreign powers: the Tyrol and Trieste by Austria, Nice and Corsica by France, Malta by England; this was Italia irredenta (unredeemed Italy). The *Irredentist* party threatened Austria, especially by sending to the malcontents in the Tyrol and in Trieste messengers and calls to revolution. The Cairoli ministry permitted free agitation by the *Irredentist* republicans. The excitement increased; a cook, Passanante, tried to assassinate the King at Naples (November, 1878); *Barsanti Clubs* were formed in honour of Barsanti, a subordinate officer who was shot for disobedience, and later *Oberdank Clubs* (Oberdank was a young student of Trieste condemned to death in 1882 for having conspired to assassinate the Emperor of Austria). The German governments, as in Cavour's time, suspected the Italian government of secretly encouraging the republican agitation for the delivery of Italian provinces in foreign control. Austria advanced troops toward the frontier and remained in very cool relations with Italy. This was the period of the Cairoli ministries (1878-81).*

But when France took possession of Tunis, in spite of Italy's objections, public opinion turned suddenly against France, and Cairoli, France's friend, fell beyond hope of recall. Depretis and Crispi, Germany's supporters, took the ministry, concluded the Triple Alliance, and stopped all the Irredentist and Republican agitations.

Depretis quarrelled very soon with his allies of the Left, but kept his position through the King's favour. He declared that

* December 18, 1878, the Depretis ministry, without a platform and without a majority, was overthrown by Cairoli and Nicotera.—July 12, 1879, the Cairoli ministry was left in minority, reconstructed November 24 by a Cairoli-Depretis coalition, and overthrown by a Crispi-Nicotera-Zanardelli coalition in April, 1880; retained its place by means of a dissolution; overthrown again April 7, 1881, but once more re-established;—May 28, 1881, Depretis ministry.

the Left had exhausted his platform of 1876 and limited himself to maintaining the constitution and the national monarchy, or, in other words, to fighting the Republicans; he called upon the members of the Right who were willing to join him. This he called the *transformismo* (September, 1882). Depretis governed (1882-87) with a coalition of Centres against the other chiefs of the Left. His system was to abandon ministers who were too sharply attacked and to reconstruct a new ministry from the remains of the old one (he formed eight ministries). The five other chiefs of the Left declared this system unconstitutional and formed (November, 1883) a general coalition of deputies from central Italy, which became known as the *Pentarchy* (Cairolì, Crispi, Nicotera, Zanardelli, and Baccharini). A new socialist party began to make its appearance at the elections of 1886, chiefly in Lombardy and the Romagna; the ministry fought against it and dissolved all the workingmen's clubs.

But this ministry failed in its colonial policy. The Pentarchists profited by the expenditure and failure of the Abyssinian expedition (begun in 1885) to force Depretis to take into his ministry two of their men, Crispi and Zanardelli (April, 1887). Depretis died in July. (Successive Depretis ministries: May 28, 1882; August, 1883; 1884; 1885; 1887.)

Crispi's Government (1887-96).—Crispi supplanted Depretis in the King's confidence, and pursued Depretis' policy, the Triple Alliance and war on the Republicans. He also advocated a new classification of parties, declaring that the terms *Right* and *Left* had lost their significance, and that what Italy needed was two great constitutional parties. He affirmed that his ministry would be strictly parliamentary, that he loved liberty and wished for peace, both at home and abroad; he announced no great reform projects, but simply the intention of improving the administration of justice, the management of education, the army, industry, and trade. He placed his reliance on the Left, which promised him a large majority. His administration was mainly occupied with combatting the opponents of the monarchy—the Pope, the Republicans, the Irredentists, and the Socialists.

Depretis had tried to settle the Church question by a reconciliation with the Pope; the King said, in 1887, that the relations with the Holy See were going to become better; but Leo XIII. refused to renounce his temporal power, and Crispi opened the contest once more. The new penal code (1889) punished with imprisonment and hard labour any attempt against the unity of the state, and with one year's imprisonment any servant of the

Church who should, in the performance of his office, criticise any action on the part of the government.

Crispi placed the Republican and *Irredentist* agitation in the hands of the police. He suppressed the demonstrations of the unemployed in Rome (February, 1888), dissolved the committee on Trieste and Trent as menacing the alliance with Austria, "the foundation of the peace of Europe, and the guarantee of Italian independence and unity," forbade the celebration in honour of Oberdank (1889), the celebration in memory of the Roman Republic of 1849, the democratic congress at Catania, and declared the Barsanti and Oberdank clubs disbanded (August, 1890). He even had the King dismiss one of his own colleagues, the minister of finance, for having listened without protest to an *Irredentist* speech at a banquet.

He declared himself an enthusiastic advocate of the Triple Alliance (March 17, 1888); and, in spite of the enormous charges on the budget, protested against any idea of disbanding the army (February, 1889). "If," he said, "Italy alone disarmed, she would commit a crime" (November, 1890). He continued his attempts on the Red Sea, where he finally succeeded in establishing the colony of Erythrea and the protectorate over the Abyssinian Empire.

The expenses of this colonial policy and the business crisis upset the balance of the budget. In 1887 Italy entered upon a chronic state of deficit, and Italian bonds began to fall again. The opposition Right in the Chamber and the Republican party through the country began to attack the government on its financial policy, and demanded a reduction of military expenses. But Crispi had the King on his side, the great head of the army, and as he controlled the elections, he secured for himself a devoted majority in the House. The Chamber elected in November, 1890, after a dissolution, was four-fifths made up of supporters of the ministry. Italy, like France under the Guizot ministry, was, though under parliamentary forms, governed by a partnership between the King and his prime minister. But Crispi had in his Republican past learned to consider public opinion and to try and make himself popular. Contrary to the demands of the Republicans, he appealed to patriotism, presenting the military monarchy and the Triple Alliance as necessary guarantees of Italian unity, threatened by France and the Pope, and defending the Red Sea expeditions in the name of the honour of the Italian armies. The violent attacks made by French papers furthered his policy, for, in reproaching Crispi with

megalomania, they wounded Italian pride, for all Italy was desirous of becoming a colonial power. As far as one can see into Italian opinion, it seems that Crispi must have given the impression, to the middle classes at least, of being the one minister necessary to Italian honour.

He lost his ministry suddenly in January, 1891, by an ill-judged remark in the Chamber, which offended the deputies of the Right,* and for over two years he was excluded from the ministry. It was, however, only an intermission.

First came a ministry of the Right under di Rudini, re-enforced by one of the leaders of the Left, Nicotera (February 9, 1891), which announced itself in favour of an economic policy and "fidelity to alliances"; the only reform was the suppression of the general ticket. It sought a reconciliation with the Pope, and to get him to recognise the law of guarantees of 1871; the Pope replied (allocution of December 14, 1891), complaining of both parties, the one that "wished to deal the death blow to the papacy" (Crispi), and the one that "wished to subject the Church to the state" (the Right), both of which hindered communication with believers; he demanded the complete independence of Rome.

Then came a ministry of the Left under Giolitti, without Crispi (May 15, 1892), which, by dissolving the Chamber, gained for itself an enormous majority. It was, however, compromised by the Roman Bank scandal, when the discovery was made that it had illegally issued 65,000,000 of notes (January, 1893); the parliamentary committee of investigation presented a report "regretting" and "disapproving" the irregularities, naming the deputies guilty of indiscretion, among them a minister, a personal friend of Giolitti, and proving that the ministry had been aware of the situation since 1889. The Giolitti ministry retired (November, 1893).

Crispi then resumed power and held it until 1896, reconstructing his ministry but once (June, 1894). The Left seemed to have broken its monarchist coalition with the Right, in order to resume its former democratic platform. Crispi demanded an elective Senate, pay for deputies, and reduction of the standing army (speech at Palermo, November, 1892). He declared himself "the apostle of peace, not of war," and like his models, Mazzini and Garibaldi, the supporter of the federation of the

* In the course of debate Crispi referred to the foreign policy pursued by the ministries up to 1876 (the Right). He was reproached with having said that their policy had been "servile toward foreign powers."

nations (speech at the unveiling of the monument to Garibaldi, October, 1893). But once more at the head of the ministry, he presented himself as a government of public safety against the attacks of Republicans and Socialists. He appealed, as before, to all the constitutional parties to defend the monarchy and build up its injured credit and its burdened finances. "Our country's situation is graver than ever. . . We need harmony in the Chambers without party difference; I invite you to arrange a truce of God. . . Until 1890 we worked to secure material unity of our country; now we must secure moral unity" (declaration of December 20, 1893). "Let us press close about the King, who is the symbol of unity" (May, 1894).

Since then Italian politics have centred in the contest between Crispi and the opponents of monarchy. The Socialists had organized trade unions, especially in Lombardy, Carrara, and Romagna. In Sicily they have taken advantage of the wretched condition of the unsophisticated peasants, at the mercy of the great landlords, to unite them in *labour organizations (fasci)*. The Sicilian *fasci* have stirred up bread riots (1893). The government seized the occasion to put the island under martial law (January, 1894), to send troops, to procure the condemnation of the Socialist leaders by military courts,* to suppress all through Italy the right of public meeting and suspend the liberty of the press. In order to ward off a deficit, it decreed increase in taxes and in customs duties. The ministry induced the Chambers to grant it special powers. Crispi, the King's confidential minister, has governed as a dictator; the old democratic Left, now a part of the government, has adopted the old absolutist methods to stop the progress of the new democracy. It has seemed even to give up the fight against its traditional opponent and to try to gain favour with the Catholic party by making peace with the Pope.

The Republican party has stripped for the contest; it attacks in the Chamber every policy adopted by the ministry, represents measures of repression as contrary to the liberty promised by the constitution, colonial expeditions and armaments as the causes of the economic and financial crisis, the Triple Alliance as the cause for armament. It demands liberty of the press, public

* Molinari, a lawyer, leader of the socialist party of Carrara marble-cutters, was condemned to 23 years imprisonment for having founded a society to destroy the family and private property. De Felice, a deputy, a member of the central committee of the Sicilian *fasci*, was condemned to 18 years hard labour for having signed a manifesto.

meeting and association, disarmament or reduction in military expenses, and neutrality toward Germany and France. Since the government decreed the dissolution of all the socialist or labour societies (October 22, 1894), the Republicans have founded the "League for the Protection of Liberty."

Crispi, finding his support in the Chamber becoming less ardent, had the House adjourned, then dissolved (May, 1895); in a manifesto speech he declared that the voters must choose between "the national monarchy" and "social, moral, and political anarchy," and invited "all good citizens to rally round the King"; he gave assurance that the financial crisis was at an end. As is usual in Italy, there was a large government majority in the new Chamber (355 against 172), which approved the taxes imposed by the government. The Radicals and Socialists had, however, gained seats; the meetings of the Chamber became more excited; the deputies disputed over the amnesty, and Cavallotti published a violent pamphlet against Crispi. A partial amnesty for persons condemned for political offences was not enough to conciliate the revolutionists. The two oppositions, Right and Left, joined against Crispi; di Rudini, the leader of the Right, reproached him with suppressing the liberty of the press, confusing socialists with anarchists, and compromising the prosperity of the nation.

As always in Italy, foreign policy determined the outcome of domestic affairs. The disaster to the Italian army in Abyssinia compelled Crispi to retire (March, 1896). The Conservative ministry (di Rudini), which the King consented to take, has retained its position, without having to dissolve the Chamber, by pursuing a policy of conciliation, peace, and economy. It has granted political amnesty, renounced the conquest of Abyssinia, and reduced colonial expenditure. It seems, however, to maintain itself in a very unstable equilibrium.

BIBLIOGRAPHY.

BIBLIOGRAPHY.—For the detailed bibl. of the history of Italy, see **Ch.-V. Langlois**, "*Manuel de Bibliog. Histor.*," 1896 (pp. 51, 120, 157, 167). There is as yet no complete Italian bibl. of modern history; the bibl. of the *Risorgimento* is rather more a bookseller's catalogue. The "*Rivista Storica Italiana*" gives a good bibl. of books published since 1884.

DOCUMENTS.—For legislative documents, see **Brusa**, "*Staatsrecht d. K. Italien.*" For legislative documents (Sardinia, later Kingdom of Italy), see **Mühlbrecht**, "*Wegweiser durch die Literatur der Rechts- und Staatswissenschaften*," 1893.

The most abundant category is that of memoirs, recollections, and let-

ters. The following are the most important: **Pepe**, "Mémoires," etc., 3 vols., 1847, Naples revolution.—**D'Azeglio**, "Souvenirs," 2 vols., 1867 (Fr. trans. of 1876); "Lettere," 1883, revolution of 1848.—**La Farina**, "Epistolario, 1869.—**Manin**, "Lettere," 1859, Venice revolution.—**Garibaldi**, "Autobiography" (in Engl.), 3 vols., 1889.—**Ricasoli**, "Lettere e documenti," 10 vols., 1888-95, Tuscany and foundation of the kingdom.—**Cavour**, "Discorsi," 12 vols., 1863-72; "Lettere," 6 vols.—1883-87; "Nouvelles Lettres," 1889.—**Persano**, "Diario," 1870, Fr. trans., **Garnier**, "Journal de bord de P.," 1870.—**Mazzini**: a special bibl. of his works is given by **G. Canestrelli**, 1892.

The principal collections of political documents are: "Carte Segrete et Atti uffiziali della Politica Austriaca in Italia, 1814-48," 3 vols., 1851, a publication against the Austrian government, and especially **Bianchi**, "Storia Documentata della Diplomazia Europea in Italia," 8 vols., 1865-72, documents on Italy's relations with the European governments.

For very recent events see "Annual Register" and "Geschichtskalender," and the semi-panegyric biographies indicated in the "Rivista Storica."—On political customs, **Laveleye**, "Lettres d'Italie," 1880; "Nouvelles Lettres," 1884.

The principal political reviews have been "Antologia Italiana," vol. i., 1846; then "Rivista Contemporanea," 1853 to 1870, then "Nuova Antologia," since 1866; "Revue Internationale" (in Fr.), since 1883.

WORKS.—GENERAL HISTORIES: There are several general histories in Italian, all a little prolix and lacking in critical value.—**Cantu**, "Storia di Cente Anni," 3 vols., stops at 1850; continued by "Della Indep. Italiana Cronistoria," 3 vols., 1872-77. "L'Hist. des Italiens," Fr. trans., 1862, stops at 1861. Cantu is Catholic and a patriot.—**Muratori**, "Annali d'Italia," history of the 18th cent. continued up to 1870, a chronological compilation.—The only critical hist. is **Reuchlin**, "Geschichte Italiens," 4 vols., 1859-73 ("Staaten-geschichte" collect.), which goes to 1870. The author is rather a Gallophobian.—In French, **Sorin**, "Hist. de l'Italie," 1888.—**Zeller**, "Pie IX. et Victor-Emmanuel," 1879; popular works.

HISTORIES OF DIFFERENT PERIODS: **Nisco**, "Storia d'Italia," 3 vols., 1881-85, up to 1830.—**Tivaroni**, "Storia Critica del Risorgimento," 9 vols., 1891-96.—**Costa de Beauregard**, "Dernières Années du Roi Charles-Albert," 1890.—**Perrens**, "Deux Ans de Révolution en Italie (1848-49)," 1857.—**Chiala**, "Dal Congresso di Plombières al Congresso di Berlino," 1892.—**Bersezio**, "Il Regno di Vittorio Emanuele," 8 vols., 1878-95.—**Mistrali**, "Da Novara a Roma," 5 vols., 1870-79 (period 1849-70).—**Petrucelli della Gattina**, "Storia d'Italia," 1882 (period 1866-80).—**Treitschke**, "Histor. und Polit. Aufsätze," vol. ii., 5th edit., 1886, gives a vivid description of the formation of the Italian union and Cavour's work.

HISTORIES OF THE STATES: **Brofferio**, "Storia di Piemonte," 3 vols., 1849-52.—**Farini**, "Lo Stato Romano," 4 vols., 1850-53.—**Nisco**, "Ferdinand II. . .," 1884 (Kingdom of Naples).

INSTITUTIONS: **Brusa**, "Staatsrecht d. K. Italien," 1890 (Marquardsen coll.), gives, beside a study of the existing system, a very detailed historic notice and a list of special works.—The most important is **L. Palma**, "Corso di Diritto Costituzionale," 3 vols., 1884-86.—On Finances, **J. Sachs**, "L'Italie, ses Finances . . . 1859-84," 1885; a great deal of information, but poorly classified.

CHAPTER XII.

GERMANY BEFORE THE UNION.

Germany in 1814.—Germany retained, even in the eighteenth century, the old confused organization of the Holy Roman Empire. In outward appearance it was a federal state with an elective sovereign, the Emperor, and a federal assembly, the Diet. But the organs of this federal government had no real power; each particular state, though theoretically subject to the Emperor, was practically independent. In these states, which were organized under the most diverse constitutions, the sovereigns were of every sort, king, duke, prince, count, bishop or abbot, knight, and city corporation; their internal governments were of the most varied character, but with one common trait: all these petty governments were absolute. This confused Empire had no precise limit; a number of the sovereigns had possessions both within the Empire and outside (Austria, Prussia, Denmark, Sweden), and made little distinction between their imperial and foreign provinces.

The French wars lessened this confusion. In Germany, as in the Netherlands, Switzerland, Spain, and Italy, the French invasion swept away ancient institutions and prepared the ground for the modern nation. But this clearing of the ground had not been completed. The Emperor and the Diet had disappeared, but there still remained an Austrian Emperor. Napoleon had destroyed the smallest and least promising states, the knights of the Empire, the Church States, and the free cities (with the exception of six); the number of sovereigns had decreased from about 300 to 38, and there remained only the lay princes. This work of simplification had, however, been accomplished only in the south, where the suppressed states had been divided up among four states. In the north the petty princes had not been disturbed (Anhalt, Lippe, Reuss, the Saxon duchies, etc.), so the region of small states was no longer Southern but Northern Germany. Many princes had taken new titles, and there were five kings (Hanover, Prussia, Saxony, Wurtemberg, and Bavaria). Their royalty, however, was not entirely independent.

In the region that had been directly subject to France (the left bank of the Rhine) French customs were firmly fixed, civil equality, personal liberty, and regular, uniform administration. The princes of Southern Germany copied this system in their states, but in the other states the old *régime* had been maintained. Sweden and France had severed their connection with Germany, but there remained five rulers of territory in Germany who also had possessions outside: two of these were German sovereigns, the Emperor of Austria and the King of Prussia; three of them were foreign sovereigns, the King of Denmark (as Duke of Holstein), the King of England (as King of Hanover), and the King of the Netherlands (as Duke of Luxemburg).

Germany was still, therefore, in 1814, under a *régime* of small states with incomplete sovereignty, of absolutism and of criss-cross with foreign sovereigns. She had been only partly modernized and must still pass through a long crisis before getting rid of the remnants of her old *régime*.

Formation of the Germanic Confederation (1815).—After the French had been driven out, the Germans felt the need of organizing a stronger state than the old Empire for resisting French attacks. But they had no definite idea as to the exact form to give this state.

Many patriots, brought up under the Holy Roman Empire, were attached to this venerable form of government under which Germany had attained her period of grandeur in the Middle Ages. Baron vom Stein, a mediatised knight, formerly a direct subject of the Emperor, could not imagine Germany under any system but the Empire. Assuming the Empire, the Emperor could not be of any house but Hapsburg, the royal house of Austria; he would form, together with the leading princes, a *Directorium* to direct affairs of common interest. This plan of restoration met with irresistible opposition. The Emperor of Austria was no longer interested in establishing a Germany where the King of Prussia would be more powerful than he; he refused to accept the imperial crown, preferring to remain Emperor of Austria and to content himself with a diplomatic influence over the governments of the small German states. The German princes were unwilling to submit themselves to a central government which in practice would have been composed of the Emperor and the King of Prussia; they greatly preferred to retain their own sovereignty, which they had held since the dissolution of the Empire in 1806. A sovereign federal government

would be irreconcilable with local sovereignty; to establish it would necessitate the destruction of the petty sovereigns. Now, in 1813, the Allies had preferred to detach them from Napoleon, by guaranteeing them their lands and titles by treaties; the King of Saxony, who had no treaty, had been saved by the plenipotentiaries of the Congress of Vienna (see p. 8). There could, therefore, be no thought of restoring the Empire, or even of establishing a federal state.

Austria and Prussia drew up a scheme. The petty princes, unwilling to let the two great German powers determine the organization of Germany, agreed to sign the note of the 32 "minor states" (February 2, 1815), demanding a general congress of all the German states. The great states signified their assent; then, for form's sake, invited to their conferences delegates from all the sovereigns. In the *Federal Act* (June 18) "the sovereign princes and free cities" declared themselves united by a permanent alliance, to be known as the Germanic Confederation (*Deutscher Bund*).

The aim was defined as "the maintenance of external and internal security and the independence and integrity of the individual states," but they avoided defining the powers of the federal government.

The Confederation had but one organ, the Federal Assembly or Diet (*Bundesversammlung*), a permanent conference of envoys from all the governments, sitting at Frankfort under the presidency of the Austrian delegate. They were not deputies with freedom of voting; but officers sent by their government with precise instructions and obliged to ask instructions before each vote. In ordinary affairs they acted under the name of the *Engere Rath*; the great states had each a vote, the others uniting in groups to cast a collective vote (there were 17 votes in all). In voting on certain classes of questions (constitution, religion, and admission of new states), the Assembly voted as a *plenum*, and the number of votes assigned to each state differed according to importance (69 in all; Austria, Prussia, and the four kingdoms had each 4). But for all important affairs no decision could be made by a majority; the vote had to be unanimous in order to be effective.

The Assembly was to formulate fundamental laws and organic institutions for the Confederation with reference to its foreign, military, and domestic affairs, but each particular state controlled its own diplomacy, its army, and its government. There was

no federal court and no representative of the Confederation in foreign states. In practice the princes remained sovereigns and the Assembly was only the congress of their ambassadors.

The Assembly was to open September 1, 1815, but it awaited the settlement of the frontier questions between states; it met the following summer, but did not actually open until November 5, 1816; popular interest in it began to languish. In the early days of its session a number of delegates tried to present projects, but it soon became apparent that the Assembly was so organized that it could not reach any decision. Every question must wait for the consent of each government; the government that did not wish to have a question settled did not need to answer, but only to refrain from answering. The middle states especially, jealous of their sovereignty, hindered every motion. The slowness of the Assembly became proverbial; several instances of it are still famous. The lawyers and legal agents of the old imperial court made a claim for salaries due from 1806 to 1816, which was granted in 1831; the creditors of the fund for converting the debts contracted in the wars from 1792 to 1801 were paid in 1843; the liquidation of the debts for the Thirty Years War was completed, at the end of two centuries, in 1850. The most urgent matter was the organization of military defence: now, the plans for regulating the army were not drawn up until 1821, and not applied until 1840; the forces furnished by the states were organized in 1831, 1835, and 1836, and were never united; the federal fortresses, of which France had paid the cost in 1815, were not yet constructed in 1825; the Confederation was waiting to choose between Ulm and Rastadt.

The Assembly met often, appointed many committees (there were as many as 30 at once), with much solemnity of procedure, like the old Diet; but it had no power whatever, and became the laughing stock of Germany and of all Europe.

The Individual Governments and Constitutions.—Each prince, being a sovereign, arranged his government to suit himself. Those who drafted the plan for the constitution had proposed securing to subjects certain guarantees by Article 13: "There must be established within one year a system of assemblies of estates." But in the final draft they omitted the one-year limit, and replaced the phrase "There must" (*Es soll*) by "There will be" a system of Estates (*Es wird*). The Liberals ridiculed this formula: "that is not a law," they said; "it is a prophecy."

They had purposely employed an ancient term, *Landständische*

Verfassung (organization based on the Estates), to avoid the revolutionary term *constitution*. The universally admitted principle is that the prince alone possesses the sovereignty, but that he has the right to let his subjects share in the government. The government of each state, therefore, depended on the personal wishes of the prince. Germany was divided between three systems.

1. In the pure absolutist system, the Prince governed alone with his ministers and officers, without any restraint, without any assembly of subjects. This was the *régime* of the most powerful states, Austria and Prussia; several princes of the north copied them. The best known of these was the Elector of Hesse, the only one that bore the old title of Elector, deprived of its significance since the breaking up of the Empire. He had at first convoked an assembly, but dismissed it in 1816 and governed alone. He had been driven out in 1806, but he pretended to recognise nothing that had been accomplished during his absence; he re-established his old laws, *corvées*, and corporations; he restored his civil servants to their former places, his military officers to their former ranks; ordered his soldiers to wear their hair in queue (*zopf*) as formerly, and took back the princely domains that had been sold as national property. The confederation remonstrated with him, for the purchasers of national property had been guaranteed by treaties; he replied that he admitted no intervention in the administration of his state.

2. The majority of the princes of northern Germany (Hanover, Mecklenburg, Saxony, later Oldenburg) adopted a system of assemblies of estates (*Landstände*). They made no promises to their subjects, but they convoked the traditional assembly of notables of the land, composed chiefly of nobles, and ordered them, according to ancient custom, to vote taxes and guarantee loans. The assembly made use of this opportunity to present claims; but it was only a concession granted to public opinion, not a real controlling power over the administration. In Hanover, the government could not arrange with the nobles to put in one fund the proceeds of the domain and the taxes, and accomplished its reforms by ordinance. It finally, in 1819, transformed the assembly by dividing it into two houses, nobles and commons. It forbade the publication of debates, and only permitted the publication of extracts from the journal which were so uninteresting that they found few purchasers. In Mecklenburg, the legislature consisted of representatives of the nobles and privileged municipalities; the nobles were the controlling power, filled all

offices, and maintained their absolute power over the peasants. Every proprietor of a noble estate was master on his own land; he exercised justice and police, and the right to grant or refuse change of domicile. In Saxony the King, absorbed in the maintenance of his rank, never went out on foot and never spoke to anyone beneath the rank of colonel. The government refused the assembly information on financial affairs and forbade published reports of debates. In Oldenburg, the Grand Duke declared that before organizing the assembly it would be well to observe the success of such institutions in other countries.

3. A number of princes, mainly in the south, decided to grant written constitutions in imitation of France, with a body of elective representatives empowered to vote laws and taxes proposed by the government. They had no intention of establishing a parliamentary government; the prince remained sovereign, choosing his ministers independently of the majority, and even reserving to himself the right of proposing new laws. It was simply a constitutional monarchy, according to Tory doctrine, as under Louis XVIII.

The example was given by the most liberal of the German princes, the patron of learning, the Grand Duke of Saxe-Weimar. He granted his subjects a constitution, and placed it under the protection of the Confederation by recognising the right of the federal power to use all means of constraint upon himself and his people if either side should fail in keeping their engagements. He established an assembly of deputies, knights, cities, and peasants meeting in a single assembly with the power of passing on the budget, voting laws and taxes, and of demanding redress of grievances. He guaranteed freedom of the press, emancipating it wholly from the censorship.

The other princes hesitated long before adopting a system looked on with disfavour by the governments of the chief states. But all those of southern Germany finally granted written constitutions which established a representative body with the right of voting laws and taxes, also guaranteeing individual liberty and equality before the law: Bavaria (May, 1818), Baden (August, 1818), Wurtemberg (1819), Hesse-Darmstadt (1820). There were also constitutions in Nassau, Brunswick, and some small Saxon duchies. In Wurtemberg the King had granted a representative constitution as early as 1815, but the Estates, which held him in contempt, demanded the previous constitution; a conflict followed which lasted, under his successor, until 1819.

Parties in Germany.—In all the countries, the mass of the German people, accustomed to absolute government, remained indifferent to public affairs, and even among cultivated men only a few dared to express an opinion. Those who occupied themselves with political matters were divided into three groups corresponding to the three forms of government established in Germany.

The absolutists acknowledged no other power than the Prince and his officers; they condemned every form of constitution as a revolutionary innovation, every representative assembly as an institution of disorder, every sort of constraint as an insult to the sovereign. The theory had been formulated with logical rigour by a Swiss convert to absolutism, L. von Haller, in his "*Restoration of Political Science*" (1816), a sort of refutation of Rousseau's "*Social Contract*." Haller rejected natural rights, social contract, and sovereignty of the people as contrary to history. Historically, he said, the origin of the European state has been in property-holding; every country belongs to a prince, a Church, or a corporation, and the people are only a body of tenants settled on the land. Even if the people should disappear, the state would continue; the prince would only have to procure new subjects to adorn his estates. The state being a private estate, the prince was an absolutely independent proprietor; he charged his personal servants to govern the people of his estate; he charged his soldiers to defend them; he paid expenses with his personal revenue. The aim of the state is the prince and his family. The subjects are not citizens, they have no right to busy themselves with affairs of the state; they must either obey or leave the country. This book was received with enthusiasm by the Prince Royal of Prussia. The absolutist doctrine was that of the Prussian and Austrian nobles, the majority of the German princes, ministers, and clergy. The absolutists were naturally hostile to the press and to university education, which they accused of propagating ideas of resistance and constraint of the sovereign.

The party of historic rights did not contest the prince's sovereignty; they scorned written constitutions, as contrary to tradition, and recognised only rights established by custom; but under this title they demanded the re-establishment of the old assemblies of estates that voted the taxes and controlled the provincial administration. They were a liberal aristocratic party, admirers of the Tory government. Their principal representatives were Germans of the north, university professors: Niebuhr,

professor at Bonn, who condemned the French Revolution; Dahlmann, professor at Kiel, secretary of the Holstein nobility in their struggle against their sovereign, the King of Denmark. (See chap. xviii.) The historic rights party, the one which the German historians now regard with most respect, was then the smallest, most scattered, and least popular and influential with the masses.

The constitutional party, on the contrary, invoked natural rights and sovereignty of the people; they demanded a constitution which should guarantee to citizens freedom against abuse of power by officials and clergy, and legal equality against the pretensions of the aristocracy; they wanted a government controlled by the nation's representatives, masters of legislation and taxation. They were a liberal democratic party, admirers of the French Revolution. The members were chiefly Germans of the south and west who had experienced the rule or influence of France. German historians to-day, with scornful pity, reproach this party with having been the dupe of revolutionary Utopians, at variance with history. But this party, though afterward ridiculed, comprised almost all the cultivated and literary Germans of the day. Its most popular representatives were Rotteck, professor at the University of Freiburg, and Welcker, authors of a "Universal History." Rotteck ("On Assemblies of Estates," 1819) declared that to the people belongs the sovereignty by reason of *natural rights*; the government is simply its delegate, the state assemblies represent the people and must exercise the powers that the nation has reserved to itself.

Public opinion in favour of a constitution grew so strong that the princes of South Germany decided to grant written constitutions and to introduce the constitutional system into all their states. The people then had to improvise a staff of deputies, without parliamentary pay. The country was too poor to furnish them; there were few great landowners, few manufacturers, few lawyers. Government office-holders at this time were almost the only members of the educated classes, and the voters had to choose many of their representatives from among them. These deputies, who were also office-holders, found themselves in a contradictory position, between the duty of obeying their government and that of defending the interests of their constituents. It was admitted that an office-holder elected to the Chamber might keep his liberty of opinion and divide his allegiance, obeying the government in his executive capacity, opposing it in his legisla-

tive capacity; and the opposition was composed, or at least controlled, by office-holders. The government often profited by this to intimidate the opposition by threats, or even employed a more direct process, refusing to give them leave of absence to sit in the Chamber.

Between the absolutists and constitutionalists the opposition was complete and plainly irreconcilable. The absolutists trusted in Metternich, the declared opponent of any change of any constitution, and of popular representation; they naturally sympathized with Austria. The liberals would have been glad to rest on Prussia, Austria's rival, but the King of Prussia was an absolutist who had broken his promise to give his own people a constitution. (See chap. xiv.) The liberals therefore came to detest Prussia even more than Austria. Heine said that Metternich was at least a loyal enemy, while the King of Prussia was a hypocritical enemy. The constitutionalists could look for no other support than that of the princes of South Germany or of foreigners; they therefore became particularists and admirers of the French (which has drawn down upon them the scorn of German historians).

The educated Germans found themselves drawn in two directions. They wanted a liberal, united Germany: now the only states strong enough to bring about a union were opposed to liberty; the liberal *régime* could be established only in the small states. Patriotism drew the Germans toward union, but liberalism drew them toward independence for the smaller states. The national movement was not in harmony with the liberal movement. So political life in Germany was very confused until 1848. It turned on conflicts between the subjects and their own particular governments, between the subjects and the federal government, between the state governments and the federal government. This period is filled with small and unimportant events, interesting rather for the history of ideas and literature than for political history. Three attempts at reform were made, all put down by the governments.

University Persecution.—The "War of Liberation" against France had produced a patriotic movement among the students. Many of them had enlisted in the German armies. After the victory they vaguely hoped to see the old united Germany re-established under liberal forms. Absolutism and cutting up into little states they considered a mistake. This discontent and desire for national unity produced different manifestations: gym-

nastics, the *Burschenschaft*, secret societies, and all sorts of childish and aimless manifestations, whose importance the governments concerned wilfully exaggerated, using them as bugbears to frighten the friends of order. Hence the disproportionate position that they occupy in the attention of contemporaries, and still occupy in German histories.

1. Gymnastics were a form of patriotism: their object was to prepare robust generations for the defence of their country. This idea was embodied in a person regarded with a mixture of mockery and respect, Jahn, a Prussian peasant belonging to the light infantry of Lützow, who after the war opened at Berlin a school for gymnastics. He had come to Paris with a knotty stick, long hair, and bare neck, for "the linen cravat did not suit the free German." He used great familiarity with his pupils, slapped their faces to awaken their thoughts, and made them exercise in jackets of raw linen, with long hair and bare necks. In vacations he took them off, each shouldering an axe, making them camp at night, and feeding them on bread and milk. If they met a dandy dressed in the French fashion, or an inscription in French, they circled about it, pointing and groaning. For Jahn had a horror of France; he would have liked to separate Germany from it by a vast forest peopled with monsters. He avoided every word of French extraction, and used only Germanic words. His disciples formed a "society for the German language," which replaced French words by their German equivalents: *Universität* became *Vernunftturnplatz* (gymnasium of reason). Jahn had no further political ideas, and almost all his pupils came from among young men educated in the secondary schools.

2. The *Burschenschaft* was an association of students, designed to cultivate among its members religious sentiment, virtuous principles, and patriotic devotion. The *Burschen* (comrades) wore a sombre costume with a high collar, "the Germanic-Christian dress"; they had adopted the colours of the volunteers of 1813, red, black, and gold; they met to sing patriotic songs. They had organized themselves on a new principle in the German universities. The former associations (which still exist in all the German universities), as their official name (*Landmannschaft*) indicates, were simply little groups of students from the same province who met for amusement, to drink together, and fight duels, without any idea beyond. The *Burschenschaft* now became a general association of all German students

and contributed to the formation of national sentiment. It was founded after 1815 at Jena, and chiefly by students from the small states of central Germany. The Grand Duchy of Saxe-Weimar had become the centre of the national liberal movement since the Grand Duke had granted his people a constitution and freedom of the press; the principal political organs were published there: the *Nemesis*, the *Isis*, and the *Oppositionsblatt*. Jena, the University of the Grand Duchy, and Weimar, the Grand Duke's residence, were then the centres of intellectual political activity in Germany.

The professors and the liberal journalists of the Grand Duchy organized a festival at the Wartburg, October, 1817, for the joint celebration of the religious anniversary of the Reformation and the patriotic anniversary of the battle of Leipzig. It was an official festival with delegates from the universities, authorized by the government of Weimar; Luther's hymn was sung, and the professors made speeches that could hardly be called political. But in the evening the students lighted a bonfire, some of Jahn's students threw old books in the flames, at the same time shouting the names of the works their leader most disliked, those of Kotzebue and Haller, the Napoleonic code, and the Prussian code of mounted police. They added as military symbols a belt from the uniform of the Prussian guard, a Hessian soldier's queue, and the baton of an Austrian corporal, and burned them, shouting: "*Pere, Pereat!*" (a student's refrain answering to "To — with!").

This childish performance was talked of all over Germany, and in the political stagnation of the time it had the look of a student revolt against the authorities. Metternich represented it as a product of the Revolution. A Roumanian seigneur, Stourdza, denounced the universities to the Tsar as hotbeds of conspiracy. The Grand Duke of Weimar was obliged to establish a censorship of the press in his state.

3. Secret societies were in fashion all over Europe. The oldest in Germany, the famous *Tugendbund*, formed in Prussia about 1809 to resist the French, had been ordered to disband by the Prussian government, but Metternich still spoke of it as a powerful association. He wished to embarrass Prussia by giving it the name of a nest of revolutionists. After 1815 secret societies in Germany were few and short-lived; even the Free Masons were inactive there. The only society that seems to have been purely political had its headquarters at Giessen, uni-

versity town of a small state, Hesse-Darmstadt; it had formulated a constitution based on the sovereignty of the people. Sand, the melancholy student-lunatic who assassinated Kotzebue, the Tsar's emissary, was a member of this society. A Nassau student of pharmacy attempted to assassinate the head of the government of Nassau (1819).*

These isolated crimes were used by Metternich to frighten the governments, by convincing them of the existence of a widespread conspiracy, and to induce them to join in measures of suppression. Delegates from the principal governments met at Carlsbad and made decisions which the Federal Assembly ratified in four days; these were the Carlsbad decrees (1819). The German princes who had refused to make any arrangements for the common interests of their people, accepted without discussion a common action against the enemies of the monarchy—the universities, the press, and the liberals. The decrees authorized the princes to dissolve the *Burschenschaft* and the gymnastic societies, to establish *curators* in each university to oversee the students and professors, and to establish a censorship to examine every newspaper and pamphlet before allowing them to be printed. A federal committee of seven members was appointed, to sit at Mainz and organize an inquiry into “the origin and ramifications of revolutionary conspiracies and demagogic associations.”

This system was perfected at the Conference of Vienna (1820). Metternich would have liked even to abolish the liberal constitutions of the southern states as contrary to the Act of Confederation. He dared not suggest it, but he secured an adjustment of reciprocal rights of the states of the Confederation by this clause: “As the Confederation consists of sovereign princes, the whole power of the state should remain vested in the head of the state, and the sovereign cannot be bound by a state legislature when acting as a member of the federation, except in the exercise of determined rights.” They dared not close the debates of the Chambers to the public, but they decided that “the legal limits to the free expression of opinion must not be exceeded either in debate or in publications in such a way as to endanger the peace of the particular state or of Germany.” There was also talk of destroying or annulling the last remaining organ of political life, the representative assembly.

* Treitschke, deceived by the false account given by Muench, believed there was a revolutionary conspiracy.

The committee of investigation discovered no conspiracy whatever, not even a criminal act, except a small pamphlet. But the governments, especially in Prussia, imprisoned and condemned to confinement in fortresses a number of students who had sung patriotic songs or worn the black, red, and gold colours, and even a collegian for having drawn a picture of a devil eating a king.

The Opposition of the Constitutional States of the South.—Since the Conference of Vienna the governments of the southern states had protested against the plan of suppressing the constitutions. They presented themselves as the defenders of political liberty against the two great absolutist states, Austria and Prussia. The movement was directed by Wangenheim, who represented the King of Wurtemberg in the Diet. The *Manifesto of Southern Germany*, published in 1820 by order of the King of Wurtemberg, was supposed to be the manifesto of this party. The leading idea is that the true Germany is the Germany of the Middle Ages—the old duchies west of the Elbe; Austria and Prussia are only half German colonies. The Confederation has done wrong to assure the domination of these two half foreign and absolutist powers over true liberal Germans; it should give the power to old Germany.

The contest between the liberal governments of the southwest and the great eastern states was carried into the Federal Assembly. At first the southern states secured the adoption of the military regulation of 1821, dividing the German army into independent bodies, against the King of Prussia, who demanded the command of the northern contingents. Then the Wurtemberg delegate openly protested against the Mainz committee of investigation, the decisions of the Congress of Verona, and the absolutist elector of Hesse. The governments of the large states, wearied with this opposition, finally withdrew their envoys from the court of Wurtemberg; the King became alarmed and recalled Wangenheim. The opposition ceased. The governments reorganized the Federal Diet and decided that debates should not be published. Then the delegates from the German princes met at Johannisberg, in Metternich's castle, and drew up resolutions which the Diet voted in August, 1824. Not only did they renew the decrees of 1819 against the press and the universities, but they empowered themselves to oversee the state assemblies and prevent their "threatening monarchical principles."

After this the Diet met but seldom until 1830. The news-

papers were forbidden any political discussions; people did not dare talk politics. German attention, turned aside from home affairs, directed itself to foreign countries, Greek insurgents and French liberals.

Movements of 1830.—From 1815 to 1830 the opinions of educated Germans had been transformed; they had lost their horror of France and Napoleon; they detested the absolutist powers, Austria and Prussia, and transferred their enthusiasm to the nations that defended their liberty, especially to France and Poland. Rotteck said that in case of conflict between constitutional France and the absolutist states of Germany, all liberal Germans would side with France. They were less interested in German unity than in political liberty. They wanted especially the institutions of free countries, legislative chambers controlling the budget, freedom of the press, jury trial, a national guard which would place force in the hands of the people. There were even republicans like Börne and Heine, both of whom admired France and hated Prussia.

The Revolution of 1830 encouraged the German liberals; in the small states where the government was worst they organized demonstrations, and frightened the princes into granting constitutions in Brunswick, Hesse-Cassel (1831), Saxony, Hanover, and in two Saxon duchies. In the constitutional states of the south, especially in Baden and Bavaria, political interest revived and censorship was relaxed; there even appeared democratic publications supporting the Polish rebels against the Tsar.

This liberty lasted until the governments felt themselves in danger. In 1832, after the suppression of the Polish government, they felt reassured; the Diet condemned the abuses of the press and put down several liberal organs. The democrats, for the purpose of resisting the coalition of princes, founded a *Press Union* with the object of indemnifying persecuted journalists and spreading the plan of an agreement for the establishment of a German Empire with a democratic constitution. The centre of the movement was situated in a country adjoining France, the Bavarian Palatinate. The Union distributed pamphlets, held meetings, and organized the "German May" festival at Hambach Castle (May 27, 1832). A great crowd gathered, including Poles and Frenchmen; from the great tower floated the red, black, and gold flag (the *Burschenschaft* flag, now become the symbol of German unity) and from a turret the Polish flag. There were songs, speeches, toasts to the Fatherland, the sovereignty of the

people, the United States of Germany, and Republican Europe. The Hambach festival, like the previous one at the Wartburg, was used by Metternich to frighten the Diet into voting the decrees of 1832. This time he secured what had always been refused him before: a federal committee was appointed to oversee the Chambers of Deputies; the Diet declared void in advance every constitutional plan which threatened monarchical principles and promised armed intervention in every state where the subjects refused to pay taxes. It forbade political societies, meetings, liberty-trees, cockades, and other emblems of liberty; it renewed the decrees of 1819 and 1824. It annulled the press law of the Grand Duchy of Baden as contrary to federal decisions. The government of Baden tried to defend itself; it asked help of Louis Philippe, but failed to get it, and finally changed the press law. In Wurtemberg, Hesse, and Nassau the Chambers were dissolved and the liberal publications suspended.

The liberal party broke up on the question of future policy. The moderate liberals wanted to continue their opposition by legal methods. The radicals were labouring to overthrow the absolutist governments with the aid of French and Polish revolutionists; they formed secret societies which were joined by students and subordinate military officers. The conspirators were counting on aid from the Polish refugees of Besançon and the Alsatian national guard. A mob of fifty men attempted to seize Frankfort, the seat of the Federal Diet (April, 1833), and were scattered or arrested.

This gave rise to a new form of persecution. The Diet appointed a central committee, which lasted until 1842, to oversee the investigations aimed against the revolutionists, forbade the publication of political debates, and the entrance of any person into Germany or Switzerland without a passport. Metternich declared that the root of the evil was in "the faction which was seeking to introduce in the form of the representative system the modern idea of popular sovereignty." He would have liked to establish a federal police; the individual governments found their own police sufficient.

In Prussia, twenty-nine students were condemned to death, and their sentences later commuted to imprisonment in fortresses. One of them, Fritz Reuter, has told the story of his captivity in Low German dialect in a famous romance. In Hesse, Jordan, the leader of the liberals in the Chamber, was arrested and detained six years in prison without trial, then tried and acquitted.

In Baden, Rotteck and Welcker were suspended from their professorships. In Bavaria, a journalist, after four years of preventive imprisonment, was condemned to make a public apology before the King's portrait and to suffer indefinite confinement for reprinting a certain article from another paper.

This persecution crushed liberal agitation and political interest in Germany. From 1833 to 1847 there was no further political incident, except in 1837 the affair of the seven professors. The King of Hanover had abrogated the Constitution of 1833 because it prevented his paying his debts with state funds; seven professors of Göttingen declared themselves bound to the constitution by their oath of allegiance; the King deprived them of their positions; a society was founded at Leipzig to raise subscriptions for them all over Germany.

The National Movement since 1840.—The Diet, the only institution common to all Germany, had manifested its activity only by persecutions, and had created nothing but a political police; it therefore became hateful to educated Germans. The idea of replacing it by a real national government had been expressed by several isolated writers: Gagern of Hesse, a delegate to the Diet in 1815; Welcker of Baden; Pfizer of Wurtemberg. Their sentiments and wishes were summed up in these two sentences: "Nationality is the first condition of humanity, as the body is the condition of the soul" (Pfizer). The "Confederation of States" (*Staatenbund*), united by too loose a bond, must give place to a "Federal State" (*Bundesstaat*), strongly united.* Pfizer added that this new state must be directed by the King of Prussia assisted by an elective parliament. This dream of national unity agreed with the desire of Prussian office-holders to increase Prussia's power (expressed by minister Bernstorff in a memorial to the King in 1831).

In 1840 an incident in European politics was made the occasion of a manifestation of German patriotism. The four great powers, the old "Allies" of 1815, had just united against France to settle the Eastern question. In the French Chamber there was talk of breaking the treaties of 1815 and even of reconquering the Rhine boundary. This produced an agitation against

* As early as 1818 the French ambassador Reinhard, in a report to his government, said: "It is of European importance that Germany should be united by a bond that can resist the demands of the moment. That does not seem to me possible, until the confederation of the German states shall become a federal state."

France in Germany, in the form of patriotic songs; it was at this time that Becker's *German Rhine* was composed ("They shall not have our free German Rhine") and immediately sung all over Germany, and the *Wacht am Rhein*, which remained unnoticed for thirty years, when it became the national anthem in the war of 1870. The patriotic movement won even the princes; Becker received a pension from the King of Prussia and an order from the King of Bavaria. The Diet decided to draw up the regulation of the Federal army. In 1842 the placing of the last stone of the Cologne Cathedral was made a national festival of princes under the presidency of the King of Prussia; the King of Wurttemberg proposed a toast to "our fatherland."

Among the university professors public life took the form of aspirations toward unity. The Germanist Congress held at Frankfurt in 1846 was at once a meeting of scholars (philologists, historians, and jurists) and an assembly of patriots; they discussed national questions and a German parliament. There was also a professor, Gervinus, who in 1847 founded at Heidelberg the *Deutsche Zeitung*, a political newspaper, liberal and national, designed for all Germany.

The meeting of the Prussian "United Landtag" in 1847 at length gave the largest of the German states a means of taking part in politics (see chap. xiv). The Chambers of the southern states, benumbed by the decrees of 1834, became active once more. The southern liberals put themselves in relations with those of Prussia. But, as in 1832, upon the course to pursue they could not agree.

The democratic radicals, who had their centre at Mannheim, in Baden, held an assembly (September 12, 1847) at Offenburg, and adopted as their platform liberty of the press and of association, jury trial, national guard, progressive taxation, military oath of allegiance to the constitution, and a representative assembly of the people by the side of the Diet.

The moderate constitutionalists, meeting at Heppenheim October 10, decided simply to lay before the Chambers of the individual states resolutions calling for the creation of a German parliament.

The Revolution of 1848 in Germany.—The national movement suddenly developed into revolution through the example of France. (There was a small local revolt in Bavaria early in February, 1848.) At the news of the Paris revolution, the liberals organized public meetings, and demanded liberty of the

press, the parliamentary system, and a German parliament. The governments were stupefied and dared not resist them.

The advocates of unity took advantage of this confusion to attempt the transformation of Germany into a federal state. The movement, as usual, came from the south, the state of Baden; 51 liberals met at Heidelberg (March 5), decided to call an assembly to draft schemes of reform, and appointed a committee of seven members.

The committee of seven called together at Frankfort the *Vorparlament*, or preparatory parliament, composed of all the men who had sat as deputies in a German chamber; from five to six hundred of them came, most of them from the south (as it was the southern states especially that had chambers), some Prussians and a few Austrians.

The Diet continued to sit, but the governments had replaced their delegates by popular men who aided the liberal cause. It adopted the insignia of the national party: the red, black, and gold standard of the *Burschenschaft*; now become the official flag of Germany (March 9). It accepted all the propositions of the *Vorparlament*, and transformed them into decisions which the governments executed. It convoked a genuine parliament, to be elected in the proportion of 1 deputy to each 50,000 inhabitants, from all the German states, not simply those that had formed the Confederation, but even the German provinces of Prussia and Austria outside of the Confederation (Silesia, western and eastern Prussia, the German districts of Posnanian, and Bohemia). In spite of its English name, the parliament was a Constitutional Convention (*constituante*) in imitation of France, elected by universal suffrage and convoked for the express purpose of ordaining the German constitution.

The Frankfort Parliament.—The electors chose the leaders of the former liberal and national oppositions, a large number of whom were professors and writers. The parliament came together at Frankfort, the seat of the Diet, and held its meetings in St. Paul's Church. It was supposed to have 605 members; but the Czechs of Bohemia had refused to send delegates to a German assembly—so there were only 586 deputies. The Prussian provinces had, on the contrary, sent their delegates.

It was a tumultuous assemblage; the deputies had had no experience in debate; they all wanted to present their plans; the president, Gagern, the old champion of unity, did not know how to maintain order; he was perpetually wrangling with members

and allowed the galleries to applaud or make noisy protestation.

The parliament found itself in an unprecedented situation: having met for the final organization of the German government in the name of the German people, it had only a moral authority; the old governments all remained standing and retained their strength. This contradiction between its functions and its means of action rendered it powerless: it resembled a congress of scholars discussing constitutional theories; it could propose plans, but the governments alone could decide upon them.

It began by organizing a provisional federal government to replace the Diet, now become irremediably unpopular. The discussion was stormy, with 9 projects and 189 orators. The proposition made by the committee to create a directory of three members appointed by the governments was rejected, as well as the republican project for an executive committee elected by the Assembly; the project of certain Prussian deputies to give the provisional government to the King of Prussia was received with "general hilarity" and not even discussed. After six days' discussion, the president proposed to choose a prince; the parliament created an "Imperial Administrator," and elected the most popular of the German princes, the Austrian Archduke John, by a large majority. The Diet transmitted its powers to him and was dissolved.

Archduke John formed an imperial ministry (justice, interior, foreign affairs, war, finances, and commerce), which began to govern according to the parliamentary system. Parties in the parliament began to be classified, and they were organized in groups designated by the names of the places where they held their meetings. They numbered eleven. The largest parties were the two Centres—the Right Centre, of about 120 members, the ministerial party, formed mainly of North Germans, divided into "Casino" and "Landsberg"; the Left Centre, formed mainly of South Germans, divided into "the Wurtemberg Hotel" and "the Augsburg Hotel."

The 200 Republican deputies formed two parties: the Moderate Left, divided into "Westendhall" and "the Nuremberg Hotel"; the Radical Left, divided into "the German House" and "Donnersberg."

The Right was cut into three groups: the North Germans, Protestants, at the Milan Café; the South Germans, Catholics, at the Stone House; the Austrians.

The two centres, together with the unclassified members (the *Wilde*, or savages), had a small majority.

The parliament, charged with the organization of the German federal state, began to discuss the constitution. It had to solve three general practical questions: 1. What should be the form of the federal government? 2. What countries should enter the federal state? 3. To what prince should the federal power be intrusted? There was no majority except on the first question; it was agreed to settle it at once, beginning with the "fundamental rights" (*Grundrechte*) of German citizens. The liberals predominated; they secured the adoption of the principles of the Belgian Constitution, the model of liberal constitutions of the period: equality before the law, judicial independence, communal autonomy, popular representation in each state, freedom of the press, of association, of religion, and of education. After three months' discussion the project was carried through its first stage (October, 1848).*

During this time the ministry ordered the soldiers of the federal army to take the oath of allegiance to the Imperial Administrator (August 6); the majority of the governments did not obey it. The parliament, by a majority of 238 against 221, decided to interfere against Denmark in favour of the Germans of Holstein (September 5), which led to the dismissal of the ministry, and then made an opposite decision by a majority of 258 against 226 (September 16), which led to the return of the ministry. A number of Republican deputies then wished to take advantage of the indignation against the 258 "traitors" to proclaim the Republic and dissolve the parliament. But the ministry summoned the Prussian and Austrian troops, and the Republican uprising of Frankfort produced nothing but the assassination of two deputies of the Right.

The government had decided to replace the Confederation, with its absolutist principles, by a federal state with a liberal constitution; it had begun by making the constitutional plan of new Germany before fixing its limits and selecting its chief. Two other questions remained: What territory should be included? Who should exercise the central power? These were no mere theoretical definitions of rights; two practical measures must be adopted, and neither could be adopted without offending one

* The parliament had also to occupy itself with a particular federal question, the affair of the duchies of Schleswig-Holstein. (See chap. xviii.)

of the two great powers that were in control, Austria or Prussia. The centres of the parliament, after having worked together on constitutional questions, broke apart when it became necessary to choose between Austria and Prussia. A new grouping of parties was made.

The question of territory was insoluble. Neither Austria nor Prussia was exclusively German. The parliament decided that foreign provinces could not enter the German federal state; they could be joined to German states only by a personal union (October 27). This decision, without satisfying Austria, irritated Prussia, on account of the province of Posen. But the insoluble difficulty came from Austria, whose German population was a decided minority. The Austrian government was unwilling to break up the Empire by separating the German provinces from the Magyar, Slav, and Italian provinces. It wished to enter the new state with all its possessions; it therefore asked that the parliament should "leave in suspense" Austria's relations with Germany until Austria should have ordered her own future, which meant not to make the constitution of the whole until the Emperor of Austria should have made one for his own states. The parliament had the choice of two solutions: either admit the whole Austrian Empire into the Confederation, which would have meant to renounce federal unity and content itself with a tie sufficiently loose to include non-German peoples; or to organize a federal government strongly knit together and leaving out the German provinces of Austria, which would be to renounce German unity.

The parliament and the German people divided into two parties. The Great Germany (*Grossdeutsche*) party, in order to preserve German unity, resigned themselves to union with Austria—the traditional sentiment expressed in Arndt's famous patriotic song: "What is the German fatherland? . . . As far as the German tongue is heard." They could not imagine a German fatherland that shut out the Tyrolese and Austrians. The Little Germany (*Kleindeutsche*) party, in order to create a real federal state, resigned themselves to the reduction of territory involved in the exclusion of Austria. This question of limitation was allied to the question of the central power. If the German Confederation should admit Austria, it could have no other head than the Emperor of Austria, who was superior in title, traditional rights, and in the importance of his possessions; if the federal state should be constituted without Austria, the King of Prussia

alone could be the head. Thus the Great Germany party was an Austrian party, the Little Germany a Prussian party.

After some very lively contests the Prussian party prevailed. The parliament, by 261 votes against 224, authorized the imperial ministry to enter into diplomatic relations with Austria, thus declaring that Austria was considered a foreign state. The Centres had voted for Little Germany, the extreme Republicans and the Right for Great Germany (January 13, 1849).

This decision involved an answer to the last question, that of the central power. The parliament voted by a majority of 258 against 211: "The dignity of the supreme chief of the Empire should be intrusted to one of the reigning German princes," and by a majority of 9 votes only: "This chief shall bear the title of *Emperor of the Germans*." Two months later the government of Austria proposed that the whole Austrian Empire, with its 30,000,000 inhabitants, should enter the Confederation, and should have 38 votes against 32 for all the rest of Germany. A number of deputies, indignant at this officiousness, left the Austrian party; the parliament declared the Empire hereditary, and by 290 votes elected the King of Prussia to be Emperor of the Germans (March 28).

The execution of parliamentary decisions, however, depended on the individual governments. The King of Prussia wanted the Imperial Crown, but he wanted to receive it from the princes, his equals, not from an assembly of subjects. That which the parliament was offering him he called "a crown of mud and wood," and said: "If anyone is to award the crown of the German nation, it is myself and my equals who shall give it." He officially declared himself unable to accept until he should have conferred with the princes and examined the constitution. The parliament had to choose between the constitution and the King of Prussia; the majority decided to stand by the constitution. The King asked the advice of the other governments. Twenty-eight states accepted the constitution, the hereditary Empire, and the election; the four Kings (Bavaria, Wurtemberg, Saxony, and Hanover) rejected the election, not wishing to be subject to the King of Prussia, their equal. Austria broke openly with the parliament and withdrew her deputies. The King of Prussia was alarmed and refused the Empire absolutely (April 28, 1849).

The parliament, deserted by Prussia, decided (by 190 votes against 188) to promulgate the constitution in spite of the princes, and to convoke the electors for July 15. It was then the Repub-

licans who became the defenders of the constitution and tried to force the governments to recognise it. There had been already two Republican insurrections in the Grand Duchy of Baden in 1848. In May, 1849, there were risings in the Kingdom of Prussia (Rhine province, Breslau, and Königsberg), the Kingdom of Saxony (Dresden), the Grand Duchy of Baden, and the Bavarian Palatinate. The King of Saxony and the Grand Duke of Baden fled and asked help from the King of Prussia. The Prussian guard took Dresden after two days' fighting. The governments recalled their deputies from Frankfort; the Imperialists retired; only the determined Republicans remained.

The parliament, reduced to 105 members, almost all of whom were south Germans, moved to Stuttgart (June 6), and elected an Imperial Regency of 5 members. But it soon came into conflict with the government of Wurtemberg, which closed the hall and dispersed the deputies. The Baden insurgents had formed a provisional government which controlled Baden and the Palatinate; they had with them a number of rebel regiments. A Prussian army arrived; there was a genuine war; the insurgents were conquered and dispersed; the councils of war had a part of the prisoners shot. Many Republicans fled to Switzerland, France, and America. This repression had lasting effect: the Republican party, very numerous in southern Germany, was exterminated, and has never been entirely reorganized. (On socialist parties in Germany from 1848 to 1850, see chap. xxiv.)

The Prussian Union.—The attempt to establish a German federal state by a national assembly had failed; the Prussian government tried to revive it by an understanding with the governments. It had now prestige in the eyes of the princes for having fought and crushed the revolution. It was free from Austria, which was absorbed with wars in Italy and Hungary. It proposed to organize a provisional government and to revise the constitution voted by the parliament in order to cut out the excessively democratic clauses. This was all discussed at the Conference of Berlin, May 17, 1849. But again the same question came up that had faced the parliament: What should be the position of the Emperor of Austria in the new state? Prussia proposed to create a federative state headed by the King of Prussia, who would later conclude a wider alliance with Austria. The Austrian government immediately retired.

The two North German Kings, Hanover and Saxony, not daring to refuse openly, concluded a one-year alliance with Prussia.

The Prussian plan of constitution established a government with two Chambers: *Chamber of the states*, composed of 160 delegates from the governments; *Chamber of the people*, composed of elective deputies. Seventeen German states accepted the terms, but the two Kings of Wurtemberg and Bavaria refused to yield to them. The Prussian national party, however, had still some hopes of seeing the union realized. One hundred and fifty former members of the Centres in the Frankfort parliament met at Gotha, to come to an agreement on a plan for aiding Prussia by sacrificing the constitution voted in 1849.

But the King of Prussia personally hesitated at leaning on an elective Assembly; he refused to convoke a parliament in 1849, and lost time in negotiation with the governments. Austria used this delay to end her Italian and Hungarian wars, and when the King of Prussia decided to call for an election, the two Kings of Saxony and Hanover, encouraged by Austria, protested; they then withdrew. The King of Prussia tried to organize a *Union* with the little states. A parliament elected by the inhabitants of these states (January, 1850) met at Erfurt in March; being composed of advocates of the Union, it voted the constitution which the Prussian government laid before it. Meanwhile the kingdoms which opposed the Union proposed an organization which should include Austria, with a directory of seven members and a parliament with an equal number of Austrian, Prussian, and German delegates. Austria accepted, Prussia refused (February-March, 1850).

The Austrian government convoked the German states at Frankfort to reorganize the old Diet. Prussia replied by convoking at Berlin a congress of the states of the Union. Meanwhile the German states were grouped into two opposing leagues: that of Berlin, which favoured the Prussian party and Little Germany; that of Frankfort, which favoured the Austrian party and Great Germany. But one by one the states deserted Prussia and joined the Frankfort conference. The King of Prussia, threatened with war with Austria, hesitated, then yielded. The Austrian government exacted the formal dissolution of the Union (November 15, 1850). Schwartzemberg said openly that "Prussia must be degraded, then demolished." (On the part played by Russia and the Conference of Olmütz, see chap. xxvi.)

German Reaction.—Now that Prussia had been forced to renounce the rôle of director, Austria proposed to the German states, that the whole Austrian Empire should come into the

Confederation. The Dresden conference made a pretence of discussing the project; but the German princes did not like it, and Austria gave it up. Finally they re-established the old Confederation as it was before 1848, and the Diet, meeting as formerly at Frankfort (May, 1851), appointed a committee to study the best means of securing domestic peace in Germany. This "reactionary committee," as it was called, recommended a revision of the new constitutions in order to cut out all revolutionary tendencies: universal suffrage and the military oath of allegiance to the constitution.

During the revolutionary period of 1848 several governments had adopted democratic constitutions, extended the right of voting to universal suffrage, established jury trial, national guard, and freedom of the press. The Diet repealed the "fundamental rights" voted by the parliament in 1849. Then the government of each state worked systematically to restore the system which had been in existence before 1848 (often called the *Vormärzische Zustände*, the system prevailing previous to March, 1848), repressing the liberal customs of every sort which their subjects had adopted during the revolution. This reaction consisted chiefly of press prosecutions, espionage of office-holders and suspected persons, dissolution of the Chambers, official pressure on voters and in the Chambers, bickerings at the frontier, passports, domiciliary visits, suppression of jury trial, special courts, government agents hired to instigate and then denounce political offences, etc. The governments sought allies in the churches, favoured professors of theology and orthodox pastors, and placed the schools under clerical direction.

The Diet, as before 1848, was directed by Austria. But the Austrian government had changed its attitude toward Prussia. The new Prussian envoy, Bismarck, described his experiences at Frankfort (1851-58) in a report which has since become famous (*Report on the necessity of inaugurating an independent Prusso-German policy*, March, 1858). Previous to 1848, he said, Austria and Prussia worked together in the Diet and "reduced its action to a small number of unimportant matters. . . Matters on which they did not agree were not brought forward. . . Since 1851, debates in the Diet present an entirely different aspect. Schwarzenberg adopted the plan of securing to Austria the leadership of Germany by the means that the Constitution of the Confederation offered." Bismarck then explained the methods of Austria's influence over the German princes, over manufacturers

and financiers, showing how she is assured of a certain majority in the Diet, and works to "enlarge the sphere of the instrument at her service" by increasing the number of affairs as to which decisions may be taken by the majority.

Thus the restored Diet served Austria as an instrument to maintain the absolutist system against the liberals, and the Confederation against the Prussian government.

BIBLIOGRAPHY.

BIBLIOGRAPHY.—For the history of all the German countries, Germany, Prussia, and Austria, it is always safe to refer to **Dahlmann-Waitz**, "Quellenkunde der Deutschen Geschichte," 6th edition, revised by **Steindorff**, 1894, the best of all the national historical bibliographies. For works published since 1893, see the periodical bibliography published as an appendix to the "Deutsche Zeitschrift für Geschichtswissenschaft." *

DOCUMENTS.—The official documents of the Diet have been published by **Klüber**, 1830–33, **G. von Meyer**, 1821–27, **Zöpfl**, 1858–69; the constitutions of the individual states, by **Posnitz**, and **Bülan**, 1832–47, and **Zachariae**, 1855–62.—For parliamentary acts of 1848 and 1849, see "Quellenkunde," nos. 6066 to 6073.—For operations in the Diet after 1850, the collection of documents by **Poschinger** (reports of Bismarck, Prussian envoy).

The most important of the letters and memoirs are **Gentz** (in the service of the Austrian government, a confidant of Metternich), **Varnhagen von Ense**, Liberal.

WORKS.—The most detailed history is **Treitschke**, "Deutsche Gesch. in XIX^{ten} Jahrhundert," 5 vols., last edition, 1886–95, stopped by the death of the author in 1848; very partial and violent (Prussian and conservative), but well informed and agreeable reading. The most reliable outline is **C. Bulle**, "Gesch. der Neuesten Zeit," 2d edit., 1886–87.—The volume of the Oncken collection, **G. Flathe**, "Zeitalter der Restauration und der Revolution" (1883), is mediocre.—The "Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie," which began in 1875 and is to be completed in 40 vols., consists of *signed* articles, biographies of scientific value.—In French: **Gervinus**, "Hist. du XIX^e Siècle" (trans. from the Germ.), stops at 1830; now out of print.—**Van Deventer**, "Cinquante Années de l'Hist. Fédérale de l'Allemagne," 1870, Belgian, popular work.

ON THE DIET: **K. Fischer**, "Die Nation und der Bundestag," 1880, a good account of the faults in the federal organization. **G. Meyer**, "Lehrbüch des deutschen Staatsrecht" has a good sketch.

ON MOVEMENTS AFTER 1830: **J.-B. Mücke**, "Die Politischen Bewegungen in Deutschland von 1830 bis 1835," 2 vols., 1875.

* The excellence of these collections has led me to reduce the bibliographical references for all the German countries to the fundamental documents and the most convenient of the general works. Further, I have felt able to confine myself to a brief indication of the author's name; for the title in detail, it is enough to refer to the "Quellenkunde."

ON THE REVOLUTION OF 48: **Haym**, "Die Deutsche Nationalversammlung," 3 vols., 1848-50.—**S.-R. Taillandier**, "Étude sur la Révol. en Allemagne," 2 vols., 1853.

ON THE REACTION: **A. Bernstein**, "Revolutions- und Reaktions-Geschichte," etc., 3 vols., 1882-84.

ON THE MOVEMENT FOR UNITY: **F. Jastrow**, "Gesch. des Deutschen Einheitstraumes . . .," 4th edit., 1891.—**Levy-Bruhl**, "L'Allemagne depuis Leibnitz," 1890.

CHAPTER XIII.

THE AUSTRIAN EMPIRE UNDER THE ABSOLUTIST SYSTEM.

The Austrian Empire in 1814.—Austria was little affected by the French Revolution. Its government had struggled against Napoleon without attempting to reform its internal organization; it had contented itself with becoming bankrupt, by the Declaration of 1811, which reduced the value of its paper money. Its territory was not thrown topsy-turvy like that of the German states; Austria alone, in exchange for its outlying provinces (Briesgau and Belgium), received adjoining provinces, the archbishopric of Salzburg, and the domains of Venice, which included the whole Adriatic coast.

After the fall of the German Empire the Emperor took the new title of Emperor of Austria (1806); all his states were for the first time united under a collective name. But this empire did not form a nation; it remained a conglomeration of peoples placed side by side under the same sovereign. To understand the history of Austria it is, therefore, necessary to describe the various peoples which compose it. These are ancient nations or remnants of nations which, before being united under a common government, had had nothing in common, and which have since preserved their distinctive tongues and administrative forms. Historically they fall into four groups, omitting the Italians in the Lombardo-Venetian Kingdom (already noticed in chap. xi.):

1. The hereditary countries of the region of the Alps, grouped about the Archduchy of Austria under various titles (11 provinces);

2. The countries of the *Crown of Bohemia*, composed of three ancient provinces: Bohemia, Moravia, and Silesia (the small bit of Silesia around Troppau which still remains to Austria);

3. The Polish Kingdom of Galicia, with its annex, Bukovina, a Roumanian country taken from Moldavia;

4. The countries of the *Crown of St. Stephen*, comprising four states: the Kingdom of Hungary, the principality of Transyl-

vania, the Croatian Kingdom of Croatia and Sclavonia, and the province of Servia. (The Kingdom of Dalmatia, formerly a possession of Venice, makes a part of the same region and the same people as the Croatian group, but by government it belongs to the countries of the Vienna group.)

These groups are themselves only historical formations, conglomerations of disunited nations. This is the cause of the complex nature of Austrian politics.

The countries of group 1 were essentially German. In Vienna, the Archduchy of Austria, and the northern provinces the German language prevails. But a Slavic population occupied the south, Carniola, a bit of Styria and Carinthia, Goertz, Gradisca, and Istria; in the two latter provinces and in Trieste, however, Italian was the language of the cities.

The Bohemian group was mainly Slavic (Czechs), but there was a large number of German colonists, especially in the cities, and the northwest part of Bohemia which touches Germany had been almost entirely Germanized.

The Galician group was Slavic, but of two different races. Polish Catholics occupied the whole west, while in the east, formerly taken from the Russians, they formed only the aristocracy. The majority in the east were Ruthenians; these had formerly been orthodox, but now belonged to the United Greek Church, and were affiliated with Catholicism, while preserving their Slavic ceremony and their married priests. Bukovina had a Roumanian population.

The group of the Crown of St. Stephen was the most heterogeneous of all. The chief state, the Kingdom of Hungary, was Magyar, but with many German colonies, scattered over the plains, especially in the west; and an almost solid Slavic population, the Slovacks, in the northwest, adjoining Moravia. Transylvania was composed of orthodox Roumanian peasants, under two ruling peoples: the Magyars from Hungary and Protestant *German* colonists (Saxons), who had been established in the central part of the country for several centuries.—Croatia, Sclavonia, and Dalmatia had a population of Slavic (Croat) Catholics. The Italians, however, predominated at that time in the coast cities, and in the east Servian refugees who had remained orthodox.

There was not at that time the rivalry in language and religion that now prevails; but the differences were enough to prevent any feeling of unity among the inhabitants of the Empire and even

among neighbouring peoples in the same region. The government had given up trying to unite them under a common administration. Metternich rejected the "plan of simple fusion" which Joseph II. had tried. The Crown of St. Stephen had preserved its own government distinct from the monarchy; *dualism* was the fundamental law of the Empire. The other groups, the hereditary states, Bohemia and Galicia, were directly subject to the government at Vienna, but retained remnants of a separate administration.

The Slavs formed the majority of the population of the Empire, but a submissive and unorganized majority. They were cut into two branches, north and south, separated by the Germans and Magyars in the valley of the Danube, and divided into six national groups: (1) Czechs and Slovacks, (2) Poles, (3) Ruthenians, in the north; (4) Slovenians, (5) Croats, (6) Servians, in the south. They were ruled by an aristocracy and a government representing a minority of more advanced civilization or superior organization, the Germans in the west and the Magyars in the east.

The Germans were the preponderant force. Vienna, the capital, was a German city; the imperial family and court were German; German was the language of the government and the army. This system was the outcome of family policy, at a time when there was almost no thought of nationalities; the birth of patriotism would make it impracticable.

Metternich's System.—The internal government remained the same as before the Revolution. The Emperor exercised his absolute authority, with the aid of ministers and councils. His chief minister was Metternich, a member of a noble family of western Germany, first of all a diplomatist; he had charge of foreign affairs, but by his personal influence he directed internal policy also.

Francis II., in spite of the familiar aspect given by his simple manners and his Vienna dialect, was thoroughly imbued with the spirit of absolutism, very firm against any sort of opposition; as described by his uncle Joseph II., he was conservative because of his "indifference, indecision, and fear of being bored." He abhorred the idea of reform, comparing his empire to an old house which would crumble away if he should try to repair it. Metternich, a man of society, a brilliant conversationalist, sceptical, well read, smiling, and affable, had erected his conservative feelings into a theory; he talked continually of fighting the Revo-

lution, which meant practically to prevent any change and avoid any form of popular control. He fought the Revolution in Europe by maintaining absolute governments; he fought it in Austria by preserving the old *régime*.

The central government at Vienna was a medley of ministers and governing boards, or collective ministries, some of them having jurisdiction over the whole empire, some over a group of provinces. The former chief council, the *Haus-Hof-Staatskanzlei*, managed foreign affairs, police, and finance; but there were special chancelleries for Bohemia and Galicia, Austria and Illyria, and the Lombardo-Venetian Kingdom; the special councils (Hofstelle) of Hungary, Transylvania, the Aulic Council of War, the Aulic Chamber, and the general board of audit were preserved. In order to make this machinery work together, the Emperor, in 1814, had ordered "conferences" between the heads of departments and certain confidential councillors. It was not until later, under his successor, that the *Conference*, a sort of ministerial council, was organized. The Council of State, which was reorganized in 1814, was reduced to a consultative function.

These bodies, all interfering with one another, and unable to decide a question without endless writing and formality, conducted affairs with proverbial slowness, leaving to the Emperor the responsibility of deciding the smallest details. And all these official managers managed nothing at all. The government, having neither accounts to render nor public opinion to contend with, worked secretly and arbitrarily. No one could get a clear view of the public finances. After 1814 there was always a deficit, but this deficit was not acknowledged; it was always covered with remnants of loans made to defray special expenses.

This administration of scribbling formalists shrunk from coming to any decision. Each referred a measure to another, without daring to settle anything. When Stadion, governor of Dalmatia, required regulations for the communes of his province, he had to enact them on his own responsibility; this gained him the reputation of a hot-headed man.

Officially, society remained aristocratic. Nobles were exempt from military service and common courts; they alone had the right to acquire noble lands and fill high offices. On their own estates they retained the seigniorial powers of police, justice, and the regulation of industry. Peasants were subject to seigniorial justice, seigniorial dues, and corvée on the lands of the seigneur. Provincial administration remained divided between

government officials and the provincial estates, which were charged with the apportionment of the taxes and the levies of recruits. Estates were even re-established in those provinces where they had fallen into disuse. But the old estates did not represent the people and had no power. Except in the Tyrol, they were composed almost entirely of nobles, a few cities being represented (4 in Bohemia, 1 in Galicia). The estates, furthermore, were convoked only to hear and approve the official proposals relating to taxes. The decree which re-established the estates in Galicia in 1817 recommended "the avoidance of anything that might produce the illusion that the taxes depended on their consent." The session was reduced to a solemn and silent meeting, followed by a banquet; often it lasted only one day.

An example is given, however, of a concession made to the provincial estates: the Estates of Bohemia, in 1825, prevailed on the government, which was asking a reform in land taxation, to maintain the inequality in favour of the nobles; this was done, it is said, to compensate Prince Windischgraetz for the insult given him at the Congress of Verona by the Russian Grand Duke Constantine.

As the great aim of this government was to prevent any form of agitation, the government took measures to deprive the people of any temptation to concern themselves with public affairs, to talk or even think of them. This was the task assigned to the censorship and the secret police. Censorship, a branch of police, was applied not only to the theatres, but to newspapers and books; being independent of any restrictions, the censor was omnipotent. No political work was published in Austria. The introduction of foreign books of a liberal nature, such as Hallam, Augustin Thierry, Sismondi, and even Broussais' medical books was forbidden. The police gave personal attention to foreigners, professors, students, and even office-holders; they had spies in the lecture rooms, and had librarians report the books borrowed by each professor. Every form of association was strictly forbidden. A number of young men from Switzerland, most of whom were teachers, had in 1817 founded an historico-pedagogic society which they had soon dissolved: in 1819 they were arrested, held in prison ten months and sent out of the country; the police report said that their statutes resembled those of the Free Masons. In 1825 the police arrested the members of a comic society, writers, artists, and musicians, who were amusing themselves with drafting passports with grotesque names. Aus-

trian subjects could not leave the Empire without a passport and the government would grant only a few of them.

The Catholic Church was still the state church. The clergy remained strictly dependent on the government; Metternich and the Emperor held to *Josephism*—that is, the supremacy of the lay sovereign. But religion remained compulsory for subjects; students were compelled to go to mass and confession; many bought confessional letters from comrades; these letters had among students a variable price like stocks or bonds. The schools were under clerical inspection. Non-Catholics were tolerated (since Joseph II.), but legally excluded from public office; they had to pay for the privilege of acquiring landed property, the right of citizenship, membership in a trade guild, or a university degree. This set of measures was called the *Metternich system*, but the name is but a poor definition for a system of paternal oppression, slow and very negligent, like the Viennese officials charged with enforcing it; it was a tendency rather than a system.

The government forbade its subjects any thought of public interests, but allowed them to amuse themselves freely. Vienna acquired the reputation of a capital given over to amusements.

National Opposition in Hungary.—There still remained in the constitution of the Kingdom of Hungary a remnant of the *dualism* recognised by Maria Theresa. The Emperor was still King of Hungary and obliged to preserve the constitution. Joseph II. had brought on an insurrection by trying to reform it, but it had been re-established in 1791; Francis had publicly praised it. In 1820, when he came to Pesth to take part in a military review, he gave a discourse in Latin, the official language of the Hungarian government. "*Totus mundus stultisat et relictis antiquis suis legibus, constitutiones imaginarias quærit. Vos constitutionem a majoribus acceptam illâsam habetis; amatis illam et ego illam amo et conservabo et ad heredes transmittam.*"

But while protesting his affection for this traditional constitution, the Emperor had no thought of applying it. The constitution of Hungary, which since the Middle Ages had been imposed on the Kings by the Magyar aristocracy, established a central assembly, the Diet, to govern the kingdom in harmony with the King and 55 local assemblies, one in each county (*comitat*). This system resembled England's Parliament and county assemblies.

The Diet was to meet at least once in three years; but since 1812 the government had not convoked it. In the absence of the

Diet the county assemblies resisted absolutism in the name of the constitution. In 1815, when the government had made a direct appeal to them, ordering them to raise subsidies and recruits, the county assemblies decreed that they were unable to act without being so ordered by the Diet, and forbade officials to obey the call; the Emperor quashed these decrees as an offence against his royal powers. This time the counties yielded. But after 1820, when the government ordered a levy of recruits or payment of taxes in coin (instead of paper), the county assemblies refused again and demanded a meeting of the Diet. The government sent administrators and commissioners to assess the land tax and levy the soldiers. The officials of the county made only a passive resistance: they ceased to exercise their functions; but the royal commissioners, being unable to discover either the records, the seals, or the keys of the archives, could not levy the taxes for want of information. The Emperor finally yielded; under pretext of wanting to have his wife crowned in Hungary, he convoked the Diet at Presburg in 1825.

After 1830 a political agitation was set on foot in Hungary, and reform parties began to show themselves in the Diet and in the county assemblies. The movement was at once liberal and national. The Diet which met in 1832 demanded a more completely Hungarian government: more frequent visits by the Emperor to Hungary, the holding of the Diet, not at Presburg, a German city on the border, but at Pesth, the Magyar capital, in the heart of the country,—also the use of Magyar as the official language in place of Latin. On national policy all the Magyars were agreed; on liberal reforms they were divided. A liberal party was organized, which proposed to reform the constitution and society, as well as a conservative party which wished to maintain the old *régime* with an exclusively Magyar government.

Society in Hungary was still organized as in the Middle Ages, divided into two classes unequal before the law: the nobles, the only full citizens, exempt from taxation of any kind, owing no military service but in the general call to arms (*insurrectio*); the peasants, tenants of the nobility, burdened with rents and corvées, paying all the taxes, furnishing all the recruits for the army, and possessing no political rights whatever. The nobles alone constituted the political nation; there were, however, a great many of them; many lived in the country, as poor and uneducated as the peasantry.

The administration of the county belonged to the nobles. At certain intervals, all the nobles of the county met in *congregatio* to make *reparatio*, that is, to elect officers, judges, administrators, and financial employees; the elections were tumultuous, with banquets, sprees, fights between partisans of the various candidates, vote by acclamation, and the successful candidate borne off in triumph. A lively description of an election is given by one of the liberal chiefs, Eötvös, in "Der Dorfnotar" (the village notary), a romance of customs (translated into German).

The Diet of the kingdom was composed of two *Tables*: the *Table of Magnates*, formed of great nobles holding their seats by virtue of hereditary right; the *Table of Estates*, formed of elective deputies, 110 nobles (2 for each county) and 2 representatives in all for all the cities; also delegates from the Diet of the Kingdom of Croatia.

This mechanism was similar to that of the English Lords and Commons. But its working was disorderly. Jumbled together in the same hall sat the deputies from the counties and the cities, delegates from the Croatian Diet, prothonotaries, representatives from the chapters and convents, proxies for absent *Magnates*, not to mention spectators and even ladies; some had no vote; the two deputies of a county had but one vote between them. There was no regular voting; instead the old Middle-Age maxim was applied: *Vota non numerantur sed ponderantur*. There was not even an actual vote taken, for the deputies, being obliged to await instructions from their constituents, could give only provisional answers.

The Diet was not a real parliament, and found no really centralized ministry to co-operate with. Government policy was decided, on the one hand, at Vienna under the influence of the court; on the other, in the *comitat* assemblies, which were ruled by the opinions of the country nobles. The liberal party desired at once to reform society by abolishing the *corvée*, rents, and inequality of taxation, and to establish a true representative system by extending the voting qualification to employees, teachers, lawyers, notaries, physicians, clergymen, merchants, and manufacturers, and by giving each deputy an individual vote.

The Reform Diet lasted 40 months (1832-36) and held 470 meetings. The liberals presented their grievances and demanded liberty of the press, but the *Magnates*, by agreement with the government, defeated almost all the reform projects. They did, however, adopt a measure that was regarded as an important prece-

dent: the suspension bridge over the Danube at Pesth was to be a toll bridge, and nobles were to pay for crossing as well as commons; this was the first action taken against the nobles' privilege of exemption from taxes.

Meanwhile, in Transylvania, the Magyars were working to effect a union between Transylvania and Hungary. The Estates of Transylvania, convoked in 1834 for the first time since 1809, struggled against the government, refused to recognise members of the *gubernium* as not elected, constituted themselves without them, declared themselves responsible to their electors, and had their journals printed in spite of the prohibition against publishing them. The government had them dissolved and set up a military government.

Political life now awoke in Hungary. Kossuth, a young lawyer, secretary to a deputy, established the first Magyar political paper. He was arrested, held two years in prison, then condemned, but pardoned later. His reputation was made; he became one of the leaders of the opposition. He demanded a Diet for three years, to sit annually at Pesth, and the abolition of seigniorial rights. There was a Diet in 1839, and a Diet from 1842 to 1844; the *Magnates* again rejected the reforms, and the counties instructed their deputies to maintain the nobles' exemption from taxes.

The government had at least yielded on the language question; Magyar was declared the language for laws in 1836, for the administration in 1840, for the government and education in 1844. Kossuth, possessing a strong and sonorous voice, with lively gestures, had become very popular as an orator; he formed a democratic and provincial party which proposed to abolish privileges and create a Magyar government without diminishing the power of the county assemblies. The centralizing liberals considered it necessary to diminish the influence of the counties, which supported the system of privileges, and to increase the power of the Diet. Their program in 1847, drafted by Deák, demanded reform of taxation and control of taxes by the Diet. "We think it unjust that Hungary's interests should be subordinated to those of the hereditary states, and we will no longer consent to the sacrifice of our rights to administrative unity, which too readily passes for unity of the monarchy."

National Opposition by the Slavs.—In the Slavic countries, which were less strongly organized than the Hungarian, the national opposition was weaker and more scattered. It was de-

veloped independently by three peoples: Poles, Czechs, and Croats.

1. The Polish movement had its centre outside of the Empire, at Cracow, which was organized as an aristocratic republic since 1815; there the plots to re-establish ancient Poland were drawn up. In 1831 the Austrian government sent an army of occupation into Cracow, then evacuated it. These conspiracies were, however, directed less against the Austrian province of Galicia than against the Prussian and Russian possessions in Poland.

2. The Czech movement was set on foot at Prague and was chiefly literary. Since the downfall of the Czech nation in 1620, German had become the language, not only of the government, but of the university, and of all educated society, the only language of literature and science; Czech was regarded as a patois fit only for the peasantry and the illiterate. In 1819 a number of Czech patriots found in a convent at Königshof a manuscript containing Czech national anthems of the thirteenth century (now regarded as a forgery). A small group of learned and scholarly men began then to work for the revival of national pride, by reminding the Czechs of the literature they had possessed and the great nation they had once been; they established Czech reviews and clubs; the patriotic historian Palacky wrote a history of Bohemia.

This Czech movement, unlike the other national movements in Austria, extended its influence beyond a mere local agitation. The Czech patriots interested themselves principally in questions of language; they were impressed with the multitude of people speaking the Slavic tongue, and began to consider the Slavs a superior race, the most numerous and most gifted, which would rule the world if it united and trusted in its force. They wished to see it united in a single body; the Czechs, being the most civilized, directed the movement of uniting all the Slavs into one family. This was the origin of *Panslavism*. It was a vague idea; the Czechs, while trying to formulate it, expected to be supported by the only independent Slavic nation, the Russian Empire. The literary opposition devoted its energies against the German race and the Austrian government. Its hostility was shown most distinctly in protestations against German officials in Bohemia and against the use of German in administration and in schools; for lack of means of action, it accomplished no practical reform.

3. Among the southern Slavs the opposition was in the hands of the only Slavic people that had preserved a remnant of a

national organization, the Croats; its centre was at Agram, and it was at once both literary and political. Patriots began to study Croatian antiquities and laboured to build up a Croatian literature. Gaj founded the *Illyrian National Gazette* in 1836. The Croats, like the Czechs, desired to lead their brother Slavs; they dreamed of a union of southern Slavs speaking the Croatian tongue, and an *Illyrian* kingdom comprising Croatia, Slavonia, and Dalmatia. Croatia already had its national administration, its governor, the Ban of Croatia, its provincial Estates. But it was at the same time subject to two governments, that of Hungary and that of the Empire. The Croatian national party thus confronted both the Austrian government and the Magyar national movement. The Hungarian Diet, in 1843, adopted Magyar in place of Latin; the Croatian deputies wished to speak Latin still, but whenever a Croatian began a speech with the hitherto accustomed formula, *Excellentissime domine*, a general uproar drowned his voice. The Magyars carried the day; the Austrian government formally recognised Magyar as the only language in the Diet, and ordered the *Illyrian Gazette* to change its name to *Croat-Slavonic-Dalmatian Gazette*. The Croats retorted (1845) by declaring Croat the only language of the provincial estates at Agram, and withdrawing from the Turopoljes, rustic Magyar nobles established in Croatia, the right of taking part in the Estates.

Liberal German Opposition.—In the German provinces, where the government was German, the opposition was not national, but simply liberal. The nobles, citizens, and students wanted a constitutional system with freedom of the press. They had taken their ideas from foreign newspapers and political books, especially those of France and southern Germany. Such publications were prohibited and should have been stopped at the frontier. But the censorship was relaxed. Francis II., who died in 1835, had been succeeded by his son Ferdinand, a weak-minded man, and incapable of managing his government. Metternich, as he grew older, was becoming more and more obstinate and indolent. The absolutist machine still existed, but it did not work well, for lack of a head; the prohibitions were maintained, but the government agents had become more tolerant and permitted things that they were charged to forbid. The director of police in Prague, who had received orders to forbid balls during Advent, turned his back to the dancers that he might not see them. The police permitted the printing and circulation of

pamphlets unfavourable to the government and the selling of forbidden books. Publishers issued forbidden papers as covers to prayer-books or cook-books.

In like manner, in the commercial world, customs duties that were almost prohibitory were retained; but the officials permitted foreign wares to be smuggled in. Until 1844 the duties collected were ridiculous; according to official statistics, only one silk garment had entered the country within three years.

Education still excluded all modern subjects; in the ecclesiastical colleges only a smattering of Latin was taught; in the universities practically nothing but law. But many Austrians secured themselves modern instruction in private—incoherent, incomplete, and superficial instruction whose influence may still be seen in the present generation. Austrian opposition, sprung from contact with foreign ideas, was an imitation of the liberal oppositions in France and Germany.

The Revolution of 1848.—The government was opposed by two parties: the liberals, who reproached it with being arbitrary; and the nationalists, who chafed under a foreign language and administration. The malcontents took advantage of the general movement in 1848 to organize a liberal and national revolution like that in Germany; but while in Germany the national revolution consisted in the union of small states into one great nation, in Austria it tended toward the separation of a great state into small nations.

A first isolated revolt was made in Galicia as early as 1846. The Polish nobles tried to re-establish the independence of Poland. The government did not even take the trouble to fight them; they simply turned upon them their own peasants, the Ruthenians; the peasants arrested the Polish conspirators and gave them over to the Austrian authorities. The government then seized the opportunity to occupy the Republic of Cracow and annex it to Galicia, with the consent of Prussia and Russia (1847). This was the last Polish state to lose its independence.

The general movement began in March, 1848, in both of the ruling nations at the same time, Germany and Hungary, and almost simultaneously in the Slavic countries.

In Austria the news of the revolution in France was enough to break up the government. Archduchess Sophia became alarmed and demanded the dismissal of Metternich, who was very unpopular; the archdukes and ministers signified their approval.

The Viennese liberals began to show their dissatisfaction. In the absence of any sort of political body to transmit their wishes to the government, groups of every nature took the initiative: publishers, the Industrial Society, the Juridico-political Reading Club, and students. Petitions were presented calling for liberty in education, religion, speech, and press, publicity of the budget, and periodic representation. Censorship and police ceased to perform their office. The ministerial conference became alarmed and declared itself ready to convoke a delegation of the Estates of the different provinces to make terms with a government committee.

The revolution came suddenly with a single riot; the demoralized government made no effort to defend itself. The Estates of Lower Austria had just met. On March 14 the students met in the courtyard before the hall where the Estates sat; a young Jewish doctor mounted upon the roof of the well and cried: "Long live liberty!" The members of the Estates tried to parley through the window, then sent a delegation of 12 members. A report was circulated that the soldiers were coming; the mob invaded the hall. The Estates went to the imperial palace to present the demands; while they were gone the soldiers opened fire. The mob cried: "Down with Metternich! Down with the soldiers!" Metternich made light of this incident; it was, he said, a stroke concerted by certain Jews, Poles, and Frenchmen. But the other members of the Conference were alarmed, and, wishing to calm the crowd, finally obliged Metternich to resign.

The revolution was the work of students and citizens of Vienna; it was they who assumed power. They armed themselves and formed the *Academic Legion* and the national guard, which in the month of May organized the "Central Committee for the Defence of Popular Rights." This committee governed Vienna. The Imperial government dared refuse it nothing; it declared the press free from restriction, convoked the deputies (March 15), and promulgated a constitution built on the Belgian model (April 25). It then tried to dissolve the central committee. But the populace forced it to convoke an assembly elected by universal suffrage to draft a constitution (May 15). Then the Emperor fled to the Tyrol with his family. The ministers were at Vienna without troops (the soldiers had been sent to Italy); they wished to dissolve the *Academic Legion*; but the students and workingmen built barricades, and a "committee of citizens"

was established to maintain order and popular rights. The ministers became alarmed and consented to retain the Legion and to intrust the police of the city to the committee. This now became the "Committee of Security." Then Archduke John, who had been sent to Vienna to fill the Emperor's place, formed a new ministry, with a majority of liberals.

The Assembly, elected by universal suffrage and comprising deputies from all parts of the Empire except Hungary, met at Vienna July 22. There were 92 peasant deputies. They spoke in several tongues, and measures had to be translated before a vote was taken. The Germans composed the left, the Czechs the right. A son of a peasant proposed to declare all seigniorial rights abolished. After a month of discussion (73 amendments, 159 questions), the Assembly unanimously voted to abolish the seigniorial corvée, rents, and courts, and suppressed all distinction between nobles and commons. This was the principal result of the revolution of 1848.

The Revolution in Hungary.—In Hungary, on March 3, the Diet, acting under the influence of a speech by Kossuth, had sent an address to the Emperor asking for a constitution. Soon clubs and a committee of safety were constituted, which the Diet could not resist. It then began to vote the reforms demanded by the liberal party; freedom of the press, equal taxes and abolition of seigniorial rights. The government of Vienna, unable to contest the matter, granted the Magyars all that they asked: first a Hungarian ministry which was composed of the leaders of the three parties, conservative, liberal, and democratic (March 22); then the removal of the Diet from Presburg to Pesth, annual sessions of the Diet, and the abolition of the censorship. Next it granted the Hungarian Palatine permission to exercise all the powers of a King. The Hungarian ministry moved to Pesth on June 26; the constituent assembly for Hungary, elected in accordance with a new electoral law, met on July 2; and henceforth the Hungarian government was conducted as a sovereign state independent of the rest of the Empire. It forbade its officials to receive orders from Vienna, established a Hungarian army with the national colours of Hungary, a paper currency, and a Hungarian loan; it sent out Hungarian ambassadors and announced that it would not aid Austria in a war against German unity (August 3).

The Revolution in the Slav Countries.—In the Slav countries four independent national movements were developed.

In Galicia, a slight Polish insurrection at Cracow (April 26) was checked by a cannonade of the city.

In Bohemia, the Czech patriots of Prague began with an address to the Emperor, demanding equality between Czechs and Germans, and the fusion of the provincial assemblies of the three ancient provinces (Bohemia, Moravia, and Silesia). They secured the convocation of constituent provincial Estates (April 8), and appointed a national committee to prepare for the elections to these Estates. The agitation increased; the Czech national guards left the Germans to form a Slav militia; people began to wear the national dress and to fight the Germans in the streets. Then, under the pretext that the minister at Vienna was controlled by revolutionists, the Bohemian governor decided to form a provisional government with the leaders of the Czech party (May 30). To begin a realization of the idea of panslavism, the Czechs convoked a general congress of Slavs at Prague. Palacky opened it on June 2; 340 members, of whom 237 were Czechs, took part in it. Speeches in praise of the Slav race were made in various languages, in Russian by Bakounine, in Polish by Liébelt, and in Servian by Zach; they were hardly understood. The congress was preparing a manifesto to the peoples of Europe when it was broken up by the government.

Among the southern Slavs the national movement was directed against the Magyars. The Croats first asked the Emperor to appoint Jellachich, a Croatian colonel, as *Ban* (governor) of Croatia, and obtained his consent. The Hungarian government voted to depose him. Jellachich replied by convoking at Agram the Estates of the triple Croat-Slavonic-Dalmatian kingdom in accordance with the wishes of Croatian patriots. But the Dalmatians sent their deputies to Vienna, and the Slavonians to Pesth; only the Croat deputies came; they demanded a southern Slav kingdom with a separate ministry. The government was dissatisfied, and sent an order to Jellachich to appear before the Emperor at Innsbruck and explain his conduct. Jellachich, at Innsbruck, regained the confidence of the government by addressing to the southern Slavs who were fighting in the Italian army a manifesto, urging them to serve their Emperor faithfully. The government after that avoided upholding the Magyars against the Croats.

The Servians rebelled against the Hungarian government. In May their religious leader, the Metropolitan, had convoked at Carlowitz an assembly which decided to establish a national gov-

ernment and to join the Croats. They then appointed a national committee, opened the war again, and drove out the Hungarians.

Even the Roumanians, peasants possessing no political interests, revolted in Transylvania against their Magyar and German masters; they held a great mass-meeting (of 40,000 men, it is said) and demanded equality with the other nations. To oppose this movement by the Roumanian peasants, the Germans made common cause with the Magyars, and the provincial Estates voted the union of Transylvania and Hungary (May 30).

Meanwhile the Italian provinces of the Empire revolted and joined the kingdom of Sardinia (see p. 340).

The Civil War and the Repression.—The Austrian government, deficient in information and incapable of firm and decisive action, had become stupefied by the revolution; it had resigned its powers to the liberal and national parties, of whose weakness it knew nothing. When it finally suspected the truth, it began to seize its powers back by force. It asked aid from the army, which hated the revolutionists, and from the Slavic peoples, as enemies to the Germans and Magyars. Two generals managed the work of putting down the revolt; Radetzky, commander of the army in Italy, and Prince Windischgraetz, head of all the other Austrian armies. The central government gave them a sort of dictatorship to get the territory from the local revolutionary governments; the revolutionists made armed resistance, and the revolution ended in civil war. This gave the opportunity for the government to crush the liberal and national parties and re-establish absolutism. The Slavs aided the government through their hatred of the ruling nations, Germans and Magyars, who formed the revolutionary parties.

The conquest began with Bohemia. The Czechs detested the head of the army in Bohemia, Windischgraetz, as an aristocrat and absolutist; a mass-meeting agreed to ask the authorities at Vienna to recall him; then the Czech militia at Prague made a riot before his house; they shot through the windows, and killed the prince's wife (June 12). There was fighting in the streets of Prague. Windischgraetz first withdrew on the request of the government at Vienna, then returned, bombarded the city, and put down the Czech revolt (June 17). The Panslavic Congress broke up, and the provincial Estates did not meet again. Bohemia was placed under martial law. Windischgraetz, vanquisher of the revolution, gained the confidence of the court, which

secretly appointed him commander-in-chief of all the imperial troops.

In Italy, Radetzky, after conquering the Sardinians, won back Lombardy (July, 1848).

The government felt itself strong enough to break with the Hungarian revolutionists. It restored to the Palatine his full powers, refused to sanction the military and financial measures passed by the Diet, ordered a cessation of hostilities against the Servians, and declared that the concessions made to Hungary would not be allowed without the consent of the other nations of the Empire. In his manifesto of June 10 the Emperor had sworn to uphold the honour of the crown of Hungary. The Magyar national party demanded that this oath should be kept, and the Diet sent a delegation of 100 members to beg the Emperor to come to Pesth. But the Austrian government had decided to use the Slavs against the Magyars; Jellachich, restored to his powers, marched upon Pesth with 40,000 Croats. The Palatine met Jellachich on the border of Lake Balaton and proposed an interview on board of his steamship. Jellachich refused, because "the machinery of the boat might, against the Prince's will, be stronger than his word of honour." The Palatine resigned his powers and left Hungary (September 24). Meanwhile, at Pesth the democratic party gained the upper hand and the Diet appointed a committee to defend the country (September 22); Kossuth, one of the six members of the committee, became the actual head of the Hungarian government.

The government at Vienna, taking part openly against the Magyars, forbade the Hungarian troops to attack Jellachich, and sent an Austrian general, Lambert, to take command of all the troops in Hungary; his appointment was not countersigned by any of the Hungarian ministers, which rendered it void according to the new constitution. The Diet at Pesth declared it high treason if Lambert should accept this illegal nomination. Lambert went to Pesth to ask the signature of the first minister, failed to get it, was overtaken by the mob, and assassinated (September 28). Jellachich, in withdrawing, lost 10,000 men, who were surrounded and taken by the Magyar army.

This was the rupture. The government at Vienna chose as the King's lieutenant in Hungary the Magyar's enemy, Jellachich, declared Hungary in a state of war, and the Hungarian Diet dissolved (October 3). It then ordered the Viennese troops to march upon Hungary.

The war against the Magyars brought on civil war in the German countries. There had already been trouble between the German deputies and those of the Slavic countries who controlled a majority in the Assembly; trouble between the ministry and the democratic party. The committee of safety had been dissolved (August 3), but the agitation in the streets and clubs continued. A central committee was formed against the democratic societies. The defiant attitude of the Viennese liberals against the Magyar aristocrats was abandoned when Kossuth and the democrats took charge of affairs in Hungary. The Germans and Magyars, hitherto bitter rivals, joined forces against their common enemies, the government and the Slavs.

A Viennese regiment received the order to march upon Hungary and refused to obey it; Latour, minister of war, in order to enforce the march, sent a Slavic regiment from Galicia; a battle ensued between the soldiers; the suburban workingmen joined the rebels and helped them to victory. A mob surrounded Latour's house, where the ministry was holding a meeting, called him out, and hanged him (October 6). The Emperor fled during the night to seek the protection of the Slavs at Olmütz in Moravia; thence an imperial manifesto summoned the Austrian peoples to arms against the revolution.

Then began war against both the German democrats in Vienna and the Magyars in Hungary. The campaign against Vienna was short. Jellachich arrived from the east with his Croat army, Windischgraetz from the north with his Bohemian army (October 26); the democratic societies, which were now the only power, tried to defend Vienna by means of a *garde mobile*; but on October 30, on the advice of the commander-in-chief, the municipal council decided to arrange a capitulation. Just then the Hungarian army, coming to aid Vienna, arrived before the city and attacked Jellachich; the defenders inside the city began to fight again. The Hungarians were driven back, however; Windischgraetz fired on the city, then took armed possession of it. He declared Vienna under martial law. Councils of war had the democratic chiefs shot, and with them Blum, one of the German envoys sent by the Frankfort parliament to please the liberals. Vienna remained under a reign of terror in the hands of soldiers and spies.

The Austrian Assembly was transferred to Slavic territory, at Kremsier near Olmütz, and reopened on November 22. The government restored its absolute system; the new ministry of

November 21, under Prince Schwartzberg, a conservative and man of the world, busied the Assembly with discussions of the general principles of a constitution that was never voted.

The Hungarian War.—The campaign against Hungary was much longer. The Hungarians formed an organized nation, and this was an actual war between two governments and two armies.

The Austrian government quashed the Diet's decrees, declared Kossuth and his associates guilty of high treason, and conferred on Windischgraetz the command over all Hungary (November). Then, feeling itself restrained by the Emperor's oath to respect the Constitution of Hungary, it got rid of it through a trick: the oath was considered as personally taken by Ferdinand; he was made to abdicate (December 2), and his nephew, Francis Joseph, succeeded him. The new Emperor, bound by no oath, would be free to violate the constitution. In December, 1848, his armies invaded Hungary through Galicia, Moravia, the Danube, and Styria. The Diet and the committee of defence, feeling themselves in danger in Pesth, withdrew to Debreczin, behind the marshes of the Theiss (January 4, 1849). The Hungarian armies, after two months of manœuvring, under a Polish commander, Dembinski, were driven behind the Theiss.

The Hungarians were relieved by a diversion: a Pole, named Bem, one of the defenders of Vienna, collected an army in Transylvania, and reconquered the country from the Roumanian militia. The Servians were discontented with the Constitution of March 4, 1849, and ceased fighting the Hungarians.

The Hungarian army, increased to 50,000 men, took the offensive, crossed the Theiss, drove back Windischgraetz, and freed almost the whole of Hungary. The Diet, led by Kossuth, declared Hungary separated from the Austrian monarchy; it then proclaimed the Hungarian Republic, with Kossuth as President.

The Emperor, having failed in his attempt to employ the Austrian Slavs against Hungary, appealed to the foreign Slavs. He asked help from the Tsar of Russia against the "party of the European revolution." Nicholas, out of hatred to the revolution, consented, and it was a Russian army that was charged with the conquest of Hungary. Paskiéwitch entered with 80,000 men through the Carpathians (June 14). The Hungarian armies moved back to Arad; the principal army (23,000 men) preferred to surrender to Russia rather than to Austria; it capitulated at Vilagos (August 13). Kossuth and those who

could escape fled to Turkey. The war of repression shed much blood. The councils of war condemned the officers to be hanged and the first minister to be shot. Many patriots were imprisoned, incorporated in the Austrian army, or exiled.

The Absolutist Restoration of 1849.—The revolution of 1848 had been democratic, constitutional, and nationalist. The victorious government restored its absolutist and centralized system.

In Austria, the Constituent Assembly, moved to Kremsier, had divided into a German liberal Left and a Czech ministerial Right; it was to consider a liberal plan of constitution, drafted by a committee on March 2. But all the former powers, the court, the nobles, officers, and clergy, demanded that the ministry should put a stop to what they called "a parliamentary game." The ministry suddenly presented a constitution, granted by the government, which even the Right found too conservative (March 6). The next day the deputies found their hall occupied, and in the streets an imperial manifesto declaring the Diet to be dissolved "for having placed itself in contradiction with the actual conditions of the monarchy." A constitution granted by the government and dated March 4 was published for the whole empire; it declared all the nations of the monarchy equal among themselves, and established a constitutional system, with a Diet composed of deputies from all the provinces, and a responsible ministry. This constitution of March 4, 1849, was never applied, and on December 31, 1851, an imperial decree declared it abrogated in the name "of the unity of the Empire and monarchical principles."

In Hungary, the government declared that the nation, by its late revolt, had sacrificed its former constitution and must come under the common Constitution of March 4. In reality it regarded neither one nor the other; it restored its old system of absolutism and centralization. All the annexations to the kingdom, Transylvania, Croatia, and the Servian country, were detached and organized under special administrations; the kingdom itself was cut into five governments. There was no longer a Diet nor county assemblies; Hungary was governed by officials sent from Vienna, Germans and especially Czechs.

The reaction of 1849 was not a simple restoration of the system overturned in 1848. A part of the *régime* destroyed by the revolution could not be restored and a part was transformed in order to resist revolutionary movements more successfully.

What remained destroyed was the aristocratic system. Seigniorial rights were not restored, nor unequal taxation, nor provincial administration by the nobility. While the reorganization of the government was being discussed, Windischgraetz wrote: "A monarchy cannot exist without its nobility; it is useless to seek other elements to support the monarchical principle." Schwartzenberg replied: "How desirable it would be to let the aristocratic element predominate in the new form of our state, no one realizes more than I. But as forms can take life and force only through individuals, I see no way to realize this desire. I do not know in our class a dozen men of sufficient political intelligence and provided with the necessary knowledge to intrust to them an important part of the power without fearing that they would soon lose it. . . Democracy must be combatted . . . but the government alone can do it; for an ally as weak as our aristocracy unfortunately injures the cause more than it serves it." In default of the aristocracy, the power was intrusted to office-holders.

The paternal and negligent despotism of Metternich's time had neither foreseen nor prevented the revolution. The restoration government became systematically absolutist. The ministers concentrated their powers and governed directly. The laws passed by the assemblies of 1848 were abolished, and the special measures taken by the government during the civil war remained in force; Austria was under a "provisional government" for ten years.

The government systematically punished all the nations that had taken part in the revolution. An imperial manifesto announced the intention of "uniting in one great state all the countries and races of the monarchy." In place of the former dualism a centralized military system was to be created; the kingdoms, especially Hungary, became provinces under a single administration. The centre was at Vienna, in German territory; thus the policy of centralization led to the establishment of German as the universal language of the Empire, and to the giving of the administration into the hands of German officials. The Czechs, who had been government allies against the revolution, had their share of power also.

The Concordat of 1855.—Schwarzenberg had died in 1852, and the first minister was now Baron Zach, a liberal in the year 1848, but converted to absolutism. He was supported by the enemies of the revolution, the officials and clergy.

Until 1848 Austria had preserved *Josephism*; since Joseph II. the Church had been subordinate to the state; the prelates were appointed by the government and watched like officials of the government. The court was religious, but devoutness was only employed as a means of advancement for employees and officers. Zach saw in the clergy a natural ally against liberal and national revolution. The general assembly of the 32 Austrian bishops at Vienna had condemned political liberty as "impious" and declared that nationality was only a relic of paganism, because the different tongues arose from the tower of Babel.

The absolutist government allied itself with the clergy. It granted Catholicism the privilege of being the state religion and recognised in the bishops an official power over believers. To make this system definite, the government signed with the Pope the Concordat of 1855. This was the official fall of Josephism.

The previous ecclesiastical organization rested on the state's absolute right to regulate its relations with the Church, according to secular law. The Concordat offered the inverse principle: "The Catholic, apostolic, and Roman religion will always exercise all over the Empire the rights and privileges to which it is entitled by divine institution and canon law" (Article 1). This meant to recognise in the Church the right of regulating its relations with the state according to ecclesiastical law; the situation was reversed.

The government consequently recognised in the bishops not only the liberty of direct communication with the Holy See and of publishing acts of ecclesiastical power, without state authorization, but the power to oversee the schools,* exercise the censorship of books,† regulate marriage affairs, and to ask the secular power to apply the disciplinary punishments of the Church. The Holy See consented, through tolerance, "considering the times," to recognise civil and criminal jurisdiction of the courts over ecclesiastics, but the clerks must always bear their punishment

* "All instruction of Catholic youth in all schools, whether public or private, shall conform to the doctrine of Catholicism. The bishops, by virtue of the rights proper to their office, shall direct the education of youth in all places of instruction, whether public or private, and shall see that in all branches of education there is nothing contrary to the Catholic religion and morals."

† "The bishops shall freely exercise their proper authority in subjecting to censorship all books which threaten religion and morals, and forbid believers to read them; but the government shall take the necessary measures to prevent the publication of such books."

in cells apart from the lay prisoners." The Church had the right to acquire landed property, the ownership of which was declared inviolable.

The measures taken at the conference between the bishops and government delegates (1856) gave the bishops full authority over their clergy, the faithful, and Church schools and possessions.

Thus was completed the centralized absolutist and ecclesiastical system, which lasted until 1859. All political life ceased in Austria for ten years. The finances remained in disorder; between 1847 and 1857 the debt increased by a billion florins; it was raised to 2,400,000,000. In spite of the increase in taxes, the yearly deficit grew larger; in 1859 it amounted to 280,000,000 florins.

BIBLIOGRAPHY.*

BIBLIOGRAPHY.—In addition to **Waitz**, "*Quellenkunde*," mentioned under chap. xii.: **Krones**, "*Grundriss der Oesterr. Gesch.*," 1882, gives a detailed bibl. of works published before 1881.

DOCUMENTS.—The chief official documents are fragments published in **Metternich**, "*Nachgelassene Papiere*," 8 vols., 1880-84 (there is a French edit.); the reports of the Reichstag committee of 1848-49 published by **Springer**, 1885.

Among letters and memoirs, see especially: **Metternich**,—**Gentz**; **L. von Wirkner**, "*Meine Erlebnisse (1825-52)*," 1879.—**Prokesch von Osten**, "*Aus den Briefen (1849-55)*," 1896, letters from the ministers in the reactionary period.

WORKS.—The best complete history so far is **A. Springer**, "*Gesch. Oesterr.*," 2 vols., 1865 ("*Staatengesch. der Neuesten Zeit*" coll.) German Liberal.—**Krones**, "*Grundriss der Oesterr. Gesch.*," 1882, and "*Gesch. der Neuzeit Oesterreichs*," 1879; exact, but uninteresting.—In French, **L. Leger**, "*Hist. de l'Autriche-Hongrie*," 4th edit. (1895), federalist and Slavophil, one of the best histories of the Duruy coll., containing a picked bibl.—**Wurzbach**, "*Biographisches Lexicon des K. Oesterreichs*," 60 vols., 1856-91, inferior to the "*Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie*."

ON THE REVOLUTION OF '48: **G. A. von Helfert**, "*Gesch. Oesterr.*," etc., 4 vols., 1869-86, very conservative.—**Iranyi** and **Chassin**, "*Hist. Polit. de la Révol. de Hongrie*," 2 vols., 1859, very Magyar.

ON THE REACTIONARY PERIOD: **W. Rogge**, "*Oesterr. von Vilagos bis zur Gegenwart*," vol. i., 1872, work of a journalist.

ON FINANCE: **Beer**, "*Gesch. der Oesterr. Finanzen im XIX^{ten} Jahrh.*," 1877.

ON THE PEASANT EMANCIPATION: See "*Handwörterbuch der Staatswissenschaften*," under the word "*Bauernbefreiung*."

* On the character given to this bibl. see note to bibl. of chap. xii.

CHAPTER XIV.

THE KINGDOM OF PRUSSIA BEFORE WILLIAM I.

ALTHOUGH the Kingdom of Prussia had nearly all of its territory within the German Confederation, it has had a development so distinct as to deserve separate study, and has played so important a part as to make it necessary to record its history apart from that of the other states.

Prussian Reforms during the Wars of Napoleon.—Unlike the rest of Germany, Prussia had not passed under the domination or influence of France. Though conquered, dismembered, forced to pay a war contribution, and occupied by the armies of Napoleon, she had remained an independent state. King Frederick William III. had refused to enter the Confederation of the Rhine, and had kept intact his sovereign power. Yet his kingdom emerged from this crisis revolutionized. In order to make head against Napoleon, he had himself transformed the whole internal organization of Prussia.

The Prussian state, as its founders, Frederick William I. and Frederick II., had fashioned it, was an absolute military monarchy, aristocratic and bureaucratic, governed by colleges of directors (a species of collective ministries) and administered by royal officers without any control on the part of the people. Society was divided into three hereditary classes—nobles, citizens, and peasants; the Prussian code of laws, the *Landrecht*, promulgated in 1794, recognised this division. All civil and military offices were reserved for nobles. The peasants were subject to the authority of the titled landowners; every noble had the right of justice and police over the inhabitants of his domain.

The disaster of 1806 which, rightly or wrongly, was attributed to this organization, led the King to try the experiment of a new system. The reformers who proposed it to him were not Prussian subjects, but Germans from districts subject to the French: two Hanoverians (Scharnhorst and Hardenberg) and a baron of the Empire (Stein); the old Prussian bureaucrats regarded them with contempt, and even treated them as Jacobins. As for the

King himself, it was only with hesitations, restrictions, and backward steps that he allowed their plans to go into effect. Stein was dismissed in January, 1807, taken back in October, 1807, and finally dismissed in November, 1808. It was not till June, 1810, that Hardenberg was given control. Except in the army, the reforms, opposed by the nobles and the official class, were left uncompleted. They were sufficient, however, to lift Prussia out of her old *régime*.

The innovators, though treated in Prussia as revolutionists, appealed to wholly different principles from those of the French revolutionists. In France popular sovereignty and the rights of the citizens were put at the front; a system was to be organized in which the French were to be free and equal, because they had a *right* to be so. In Prussia the King kept full sovereignty, making the reforms on his own exclusive authority, by royal ordinances, and speaking to his subjects only of their *duty*. The object in view was not to better the condition of the people, but to demand of them a new effort to rescue the state from the ruin caused by the French invasion. Yet these two movements, setting out from opposite principles, made appeal to the same feeling,—love of country,—and they led in practice to analogous reforms. In order to render the subjects more capable of contributing to the needs of the state, the King decided to remove the trammels on their industry by giving them individual liberty and equality; and in order to interest them in public affairs, he was led to give them a share in managing them. As was said by Hardenberg, it was “a revolution in the best sense,” come from above, a “royal night of the 4th of August,” a “monarchical government with democratic principles.”

The general direction of affairs, up to that time vaguely shared between ministerial boards, was rearranged in 1810, on the English and French model; there were to be five ministers, each at the head of a service (Interior, Finances, Foreign Affairs, War, and Justice), with a chancellor as prime minister and president of the council. The chancellor, the ministers, and certain high military officers, meeting as a Cabinet, were to consider general questions; the King retained in his own hands the power of sovereign decision.

The subjects, up to that time without part in public affairs, were now called on to take a hand, if not in government, at least in administration. In each city a council was instituted, elected by the inhabitants owning property or in receipt of a certain in-

come; also an executive committee (*Magistrat*), some of whose members were elected for a long term and received salaries. The Council was empowered to control the city expenditures and to impose the taxes. The state supervision was confined to auditing their accounts and approving their regulations. At that time of paternal government, this autonomy granted to the cities of Prussia caused them to be nicknamed "little republics."

Stein proposed to reform the administration of the provinces in the same way, by intrusting it to elected representatives; but he could not bring the King to consent. The "Chamber of War and the Domain," which had held the control of each province, was replaced by a more regularly organized Board of Government (*Regierung*), divided into two sections, the one administrative and the other economic, but composed wholly of royal officers.

Hardenberg, who went on with the reforms, was content to copy French institutions. He created in 1812 a *gendarmerie* (mounted police) whose superior officers were to aid the administrative officials. The reform of the administration of the Circles (*Kreise*) was promulgated in 1812, but was not put in force.

Hardenberg also imitated the new French methods of taxation: He copied the license fees and the personal tax, secularized church property, sold crown lands, levied taxes on luxuries (horses, carriages, liveried servants).

The most far-reaching of these reforms was the abolition of the official classification of the people. In principle it was contained in the decree of 1807, which permitted nobles to enter on professional and business careers, and citizens and peasants to change their status of birth. The full liberty of industry and residence followed in 1808: "No man shall be restricted in the enjoyment of his property, his civil rights, and his liberty further than is necessary for the general welfare of the state; law and administration have no other mission than the removal of all obstacles to the free development of the faculties and powers of the citizens."

Industrial liberty was completed by a fiscal measure. The decree fixing the new taxes on trades and occupations abolished the monopolies of the industrial corporations and towns; whoever paid the license fee was free to follow the occupation everywhere (1810).

The emancipation of the peasants, a more complicated operation, had been promised and begun, but remained incomplete.

There were two classes of peasants, those on the Royal estates and those on the estates of the nobles. Both classes were merely tenants and, in law, "subjects," that is to say, attached to the soil and bound to perform services for the owner. The peasants on the Crown lands had, in fact, become, as early as the end of the eighteenth century, true hereditary landowners, freed from the obligations of serfdom. The peasants on the noble estates, however, had remained in their previous condition, attached to the soil, and subject to seigniorial *corvée* and the duty of rendering services. The King had shrunk from emancipating them, out of respect for the property rights of the nobles.

The French administration of the new Grand Duchy of Warsaw, created in 1807, by emancipating the Polish serfs, compelled Prussia to emancipate her own. The Prussian government at first thought only of emancipating those in the provinces bordering on Poland; but the King, on the advice of Stein, extended the measure to his whole kingdom. It abolished "hereditary subjection" (*Erbunterthänigkeit*), and declared all the people to be personally free (1807). But the peasants still remained under the police and criminal jurisdiction of the seigneurs; the regulation of 1810 on domestic servants allowed the master to inflict moderate chastisement on the members of his household.

After the emancipation, it was necessary to regulate the new condition of the peasantry. On the crown lands the peasants were given full ownership, paying therefor an annual charge. The same principle was applied in 1811 to the estates of the nobles, but in a manner unfavourable to the peasants; they were compelled to pay for their liberty by giving a part of their land to the seigneur.*

In this period of half-measures, there was only one complete reform—that of the army. This was the work of the "Committee on Military Reorganization" presided over by Scharnhorst, son of a soldier who had risen to be a general. It adopted squarely the principle of universal service: "All the inhabitants

* The lands occupied by the serfs had belonged in law to the seigneurs; in return for his right of using the land the serf had owed various services to the legal owner. Now that the services were to cease, it would seem only reasonable that some compensation should be made to the nobles for the loss. It may be that the decree of 1811 went too far in ordering that one-third of these lands should be assigned to the nobles and only two-thirds to the peasants. But the principle seems unimpeachable, unless we are to hold that the French Revolution, in confiscating the seigniorial rights, furnished an example to be followed everywhere.—Tr.

of the state are its defenders by birth." All able-bodied men were to become soldiers. As the treaty with Napoleon limited the Prussian army to 42,000 men, this little army was to be made a school in which the recruits should pass only enough time to learn their drill and then make room for others. Thus the short-term service came into the practice of armies; the old professional soldiers were replaced by young men, who pass through the army before beginning active life, and are ready to return to it in case of war; the officers alone are soldiers by profession. A national militia is incorporated into the nucleus of a standing army. This reform was not borrowed from France; it was neither the requisition of the revolution nor the conscription of Napoleon; both the idea and the name, *Landwehr*, Defence of the Country, were derived from the Middle Ages. But the application led to a democratic revolution. Instead of allowing educated young men of the noble and middle class to purchase exemption or supply substitutes, the law required them to perform the service in person, the object being to raise the moral standard of the force. But with such men in the ranks, the old methods of military discipline became impossible; so the whippings and beatings formerly in use were forbidden. Officers were to be appointed and promoted only after passing examination. The nobles continued to be preferred as officers, but they were required to furnish evidence of their fitness by passing examinations.

Political Life in Prussia.—After the War of Liberation a new series of reforms began. The reorganized kingdom of 1807 to 1815 had been cut down by Napoleon to four provinces: Brandenburg, Pomerania, Silesia, and Prussia. The Congress of Vienna, besides enlarging Pomerania, added four new provinces—Westphalia, the Rhine Province, Saxony, and Posen. The Prussian statesmen would have preferred to annex the whole Kingdom of Saxony, which would have formed, with the old possessions, a compact territory (see p. 5). As it emerged from the deliberations of the Congress, the kingdom remained a heterogeneous patchwork which did not even form a continuous territory. It lay in two main divisions: in the east, the old kingdom, enlarged by the addition of Posen and the province of Saxony, and itself cut up into pieces separated from each other by the possessions of other princes; in the west the provinces of Westphalia and the Rhine. These latter were not only separated from the rest of the kingdom by the whole width of Hanover,

but also differed from the rest in their social constitution and in their administrative institutions.

The east remained aristocratic and rural. The land was divided into about 15,000 knightly estates (*Rittergüter*), and into about 25,000 little communes, each consisting of a wretched village, having hardly 200 inhabitants on the average in the most easterly parts. Except in the cities, which were now self-governed, the region was still subject to the nobles, who had official authority over the peasants, the right of police, and of imposing lighter punishments, who also still kept the rights of patrons over the Church.

The west, revolutionized by the French occupation, had become democratic; every legal privilege had vanished. In the Rhine Province it could hardly be said there were nobles any more; social leadership there, as in France, belonged to the wealthy middle class—manufacturers, merchants, landowners, and lawyers. The municipal system was also that of France: city and country had the same form of organization. The communes, about 4500 in number, were much larger than in the east, and more capable of self-government; each had at its head a *Bürgermeister*, appointed by the government from among its leading men. The Rhine Province had, further, French law, the civil law of the *Code Napoléon*, public trials, and the jury in criminal cases.

This straggling and motley kingdom had in all less than 12,000,000 of inhabitants, and, except in the west, a soil naturally poor. To keep it in the position of a great power required a constant struggle and a rigid economy.

The work of reorganization, suspended during the war of liberation, was resumed after Waterloo. The reforms adopted during the crisis were provisional, incomplete, and limited to the four old provinces. It was now necessary to decide which of these reforms should be retained, how they should be completed, and whether they should be extended to the new provinces. The decision depended on the King, and consequently on the influences which should gain the ascendancy over him.

As Prussia had neither a parliament nor a political press, her whole political life was centred in the court and the high officers surrounding the King. Now, there was at this time a great division of opinion in this circle of advisers. An old-*régime* party condemned as revolutionary the reforms already made: some wished to restore the uncontrolled sway of the royal officers;

others to restore the authority of the nobles in the rural districts. In open opposition to these absolutist aristocrats was a group of supporters of the reforms. These, too, were divided in opinion. Some wanted a liberal constitutional system of the Tory or Louis XVIII. pattern (Humboldt, Schön, Vincke); others (Stein, Niebuhr, Gneisenau) wanted a system founded on historic rights. Hardenberg, grown old and indolent, wavered between these various schemes.

The King, drawn this way and that by conflicting influences, adopted contradictory decisions, or resigned himself to compromises, or oftener turned the matter over to committee after committee without reaching any decision. The work of reorganization proceeded very slowly therefore. The ordinance regarding city administration was not published till 1831; the regulations touching freedom of labour appeared in 1845; the provisions regarding compensations for the emancipation of the serfs were not completed in 1850; the reform of the land tax was only finished in 1861; the local administration of the *Circles* and the rural communes was not fully organized until 1872 and 1891. The revision of the old laws (*Landrecht*), on which a committee was still labouring in 1847, has never been finished. The bulk of the work actually accomplished was done in the years 1815 to 1823; the history of it is so intricate that I can only describe the results.

The Absolutist Reforms (1814-23).—The mainspring of the government continued to be the new creation, the *Ministry*. By its side the Council of State remained—a deliberative body made up of royal princes, ministers, and high dignitaries. According to the Ordinance of 1817, it was to give advice on changes of law and regulations, on conflicts between ministers, and on all matters submitted to it by the King. It seemed likely at first to become the chief organ of the government, but after 1827 the King almost ceased to consult it. After Hardenberg died, in 1822, no new chancellor was appointed. In practice the ministers, holding office for life, enjoying the King's confidence and selected by him at will, worked with him and drafted his decrees. It was a government by King and Cabinet.

For administrative purposes the kingdom was divided into ten provinces, presently reduced to eight. At the head of each was placed an *Oberpräsident*, a kind of civil governor. The next lower division was the *Bezirk*, of which there were 25, each with a governing board (*Regierung*). Under these the old local division into *Circles* was retained; of these there were upward

of 300. At the head of each was the *Landrath*, a salaried officer and landowner, obliged to pass the civil-service examination, but selected from a list prepared by the representative assembly of the Circle (*Kreistag*). The representative system promised in 1815, but kept back by the conflict between the nobles and the official class, led only to the establishment, in 1825, of these Circle assemblies, with purely consultative functions, their only real power being that of nominating candidates for the post of *Landrath*. They were almost wholly aristocratic. The communes, as already stated, were not reorganized till 1872. Each province retained its old laws and customs.

The decree of 1810 on the redemption of the seigniorial rights in the eastern provinces was interpreted and modified by the declaration of 1816 in a way even more unfavourable to the peasants. These were divided into two classes: those who had the right of redemption, and those who remained in their former condition. In the first class only those peasants were included whose holdings were sufficient to support a household; it was further required that their possession should be ancient and confirmed by the assessment roll. Only these got the right to redeem the dues and services they owed to the seigneurs by payment of an equivalent. From the land they had held as tenants burdened with charges, they retained two-thirds in full ownership if their holding was hereditary, one-half if it was not. The other part went to the seigneur. The adjustment proceeded slowly, not being completed as late as 1848.

All the other peasants—the great majority—were excluded from the right to claim the advantage of the decree. The government had given them personal liberty, but was unwilling to make them peasant proprietors; they must remain under the control of the noble landlords, who needed them to cultivate their domains. The mass of the eastern peasants, therefore, remained as tenants of small holdings, living in villages or on the great estates, cultivating (often from father to son) a bit of land the use of which the proprietor gave them in exchange for manual labour. They subsisted in a wretched way, partly on the products of their little holding, partly on money earned as hired farm labourers. But in the eighteenth century the Kings had compelled the seigneurs to keep up the number of peasant holdings (*Bauernstelle*); since 1816 the institution of peasant protection (*Bauernschutz*) had been abandoned. The great landowner was released from the obligation to assist the peasants to repair

their cottages, to allow them to take wood in the forests and share the pasturage; above all, he had the right to take from the peasants lands they held on precarious title or for a limited term. The result was to enlarge the great domains at the expense of the small holdings and to convert the great majority of the tenants into mere day labourers. When, in 1850, a law was passed to protect the rights of tenants of this class, only a few of them remained.

Thus it has happened that, throughout the whole former Kingdom of Prussia, society has continued to be aristocratic. The great land-owning nobles have greatly enlarged their domains; only a minority of the peasants have become landowners, even at the expense of surrendering a part of their holdings. The others are only agricultural labourers, employed by and dependent upon the great proprietors.

In Posen, where the government made no effort to humour the great landowners, who were Polish nobles, the proprietors were forbidden to suppress the peasant tenures (1819), and smaller payments were required in redemption of the seigniorial rights; the settlements also were much more quickly made. But there also the smaller holders were excluded from these benefits.

In the western provinces the reform had been already accomplished, the peasants had become landowners, and rural society, especially in the Rhine Province, was already democratic.

The financial reorganization of the kingdom was effected between 1815 and 1820. The war had left a floating debt and a yearly deficit of 10,000,000 thalers.* A five per cent. loan was negotiated at 72 (1817). The King, in order to save the credit of the state, directed that the debt operations should be kept secret. Its amount was set at 180,000,000 thalers, with a sinking-fund designed to reduce it. The King pledged himself not to contract a further loan, "except with the consent and under the guarantee of the future assembly of the Estates of the Kingdom" (1820).

In order to get rid of the deficit, the budget was revised with an economy so rigid that the gross expenditure was reduced to about 5,000,000 thalers. The King cut down his personal expenses to the lowest terms. He announced that the budget should be published every third year, in order that everybody might see that not a penny was demanded beyond the actual necessities

*The Prussian thaler was equivalent to about seventy-five cents.

of the state. As a matter of fact, the accounts were not published till 1829, and then with inaccurate figures.

It was necessary to impose new taxes: in the cities a tax on consumption as in Holland (a grist tax and a tax on slaughter-houses); in the rest of the country a personal tax by *classes* or graduated poll-tax (changed in 1851 into an income tax). The readjustment of the customs duties led to the formation of the *Zollverein* (see p. 452).

A reform of the general laws and judicial procedure was promised, but not carried out. Meantime the Prussian Code of 1794 was extended to three of the new provinces. The government even made two attempts to impose it on the Rhine Province instead of the French "revolutionary" code and trial by jury. The inhabitants petitioned the King to be allowed to keep their existing system, which was, with difficulty, granted *provisionally*.

In relation to primary education, which had been made compulsory in the eighteenth century, the old arrangements were allowed to stand. The reform announced in 1817, and prepared in 1819, was not put into effect. The provisions of the Code of 1794 were extended to the new provinces. Parents are obliged to send their children to school; the school is supported in part at their expense, is placed under the direct supervision of the pastor or priest, and religious instruction is compulsory.

The reorganization of the army was the decisive event in the history of Prussia. The system hastily devised during the Napoleonic crisis was attacked by professional military men on the ground that the service was too short to make real soldiers, and was disliked by the middle class because it bore so hardly on young men of good family. The King adhered to the principle of universal service, and refused to admit substitutes, although this was done in all other countries. The Berlin Council having petitioned for exemption, the king threatened to publish the names of the petitioners. The service was kept on the universal and compulsory basis; but young men who gave evidence of certain educational attainments were let off with one year of army training, on condition of supplying their own support and equipment. These are the *one-year volunteers*. For the other recruits the service was fixed at three years in principle. This period, which at that time seemed very short, was adopted in order to make all young men pass through the army without too great expense to the government. The active army was reduced to the

very low number of 115,000 men. The men dismissed from the active army as fully trained belonged to the *reserve* up to the age of twenty-five.

The King hesitated more about keeping the *Landwehr*. It was said to be insufficient for war and dangerous in case of outbreak. The liberals had compromised it by exalting it at the expense of the active army; a legend which lasted long in Europe represented the Prussian victories of 1813 as the work of the *Landwehr*. The King decided to keep the institution, but increased the length of the yearly drills and arranged to have the men exercised in conjunction with the active army. Thus with a small standing army, in keeping with its meagre budget, Prussia had in time of war a disposable force composed of all her able-bodied men, and naturally divided into three parts: the Active Army, the Reserve, and the *Landwehr*—the latter in two divisions.

This system, adopted later by all Europe, was the most original feature of Prussia. The army became for domestic purposes the school in which Prussian national spirit was fostered; and toward foreign nations it gave to a state of the second order the military force and rank of a great power.

Creation of the Provincial Estates (1815-25).—While these changes were laboriously proceeding, court and official circles were agitated on the great question of the form of government. Up to the crisis of 1806 Prussia had been an absolute monarchy in which the King had sovereign control, even in making laws and imposing taxes. The reformers had persuaded Frederick William III. to admit a representative assembly; he had accepted as early as 1810 the principle of "giving a representation to the nation." In 1815, before the battle of Waterloo, he promised by his famous ordinance of May 28 to give the Prussian nation a written constitution; the first clause of his ordinance said: "There shall be formed a representation of the people." The representatives were to be elected by Provincial Estates. But, after the end of the war, the King hesitated as to the mode of fulfilling the promise. He appointed in succession five different committees on the subject, and took eight years to arrive at a decision (1815-23).

A strong party at court condemned every sort of constitution as revolutionary. The Prince Royal, later Frederick William IV., an admirer of Haller (see p. 000), was for admitting only historical rights and detested written constitutions. The Liberal

party dwelt on the King's promise solemnly given in 1815, but was divided as to the proper form of representation for the kingdom. The King sent a commission to learn the wishes of the provincial notables. Meanwhile he received from Metternich some suggestions as to the danger of constitutions and presently drew away from the constitutional party. The excitement among the students alarmed him, and he ordered a censorship of the universities and the press. Then began the proceedings against the "demagogues" (1819). Jahn was arrested and Arndt was dismissed. Severities were resumed in 1823; one hundred and twenty students were locked up in fortresses where they lay three years without trial (see p. 385). The censorship of books still existed in Prussia, but ordinarily had been exercised with moderation. It now became rigorous: a new edition of Fichte's "Address to the German Nation" was denied the right of publication by the superior board of censors.

The revolutions of 1820-21 in Spain and Italy had the effect of making constitutional systems odious to the King.* He rejected Hardenberg's project (1821) and made up his mind not to go beyond the institution of the provincial assemblies. The fifth and last committee on the constitution, presided over by the Prince Royal, drew up the scheme of representation which was enacted as law in 1823. The King did not formally withdraw his promise of 1815, but he did not keep it. Instead of a general representation of the kingdom, he granted only Provincial Estates.

These Estates, fashioned to the taste of the Prince Royal, were not national, but provincial; not representative of the people, but of classes and corporations, with power to advise but not to conclude. There were eight of them—one for each province. In order to emphasize their local character, they were established by eight separate decrees, almost, of course, identical in their terms. Each assembly included at least three Estates: nobles, cities, peasants. In four provinces (Saxony, Silesia, Westphalia, and the Rhine Province) the nobles were subdivided into seigneurs and chevaliers. The seigneurs sat in person; the chevaliers, like the cities and the peasants, were represented by deputies elected for six years. For voting in the choice of city and

* I cannot enter into the details, now well known, of the contests within the government. Hardenberg, before proposing his timid scheme of a constitution, had come to an understanding with the absolutists against the Liberals, and had secured the dismissal of Humboldt.

peasant deputies, a property qualification was required. The totals for the whole monarchy were 278 nobles, 182 citizens, and 124 deputies for the peasants.

The three sets or "estates" met as one assembly in each province, and their proceedings were secret. Their functions were to give advice on laws affecting their province and to regulate communal affairs (highways, poor-relief). They had no direct relations with the King's ministers; their communications were through a special commission, and the King made no answer until the whole eight had been heard from, which meant, in many cases, not till after a year.

These assemblies, which the King declared to be created in the spirit of the "ancient German constitution," could be made up only by manufacturing new institutions for the purpose. The three or four Estates which they were to represent existed neither in law nor in the facts of society, and even in the provinces of the west it was necessary, in order to fill up the Estate of the nobles, to admit thereto citizen landowners.

End of Frederick William III.'s Reign.—The system established between 1815 and 1825 lasted without serious change till 1848. Prussia was an absolute and bureaucratic monarchy, like Austria, with aristocratic provincial estates; political life was confined to the royal family and the officials. But society, especially in the west, was in law as democratic as in the rest of western Europe. The nobles had easier access to public employments, but the non-noble were not excluded. It was a government of office-holders. It was long the fashion to quote as characteristic of the system the answer of the minister of the interior to a complaint of the municipal council of Elbing: it was to the effect that the measures of the government were "above the limited intelligence of the subjects." But this governing body was kept to its duty by strict rules. The Prussian officials, selected by means of examinations, had slow promotion and hard work. Protected against arbitrary treatment, they acquired an *esprit de corps* which sometimes made them sufficiently independent to maintain their rights or perform their duty; they had a reputation in Germany for pedantic consciences and capacity for work.

Public life was little more than administration. Until the death of Frederick William III., in 1840, political activity was almost lacking among the people. German historians say in explanation that the Prussian people loved their aged King for his conduct in the evil days of the French invasion, and shrank

from disturbing his quiet by demanding reforms. As a matter of fact the people had no practical means of expressing their wishes. The King, as he grew older, became more and more hostile to change, and confined himself to the settlement of daily business. In the last fifteen years of his reign the only domestic events of note were the crusade against the agitators of 1834 and the Church troubles. As a result of the first, thirty-nine students were sentenced to death, but were reprieved and confined in fortresses.

The Church troubles were twofold. A conflict with the Lutheran Church grew out of a plan of conciliation. The King had expressed a wish to bring about a *Union* between the Lutheran and Calvinistic churches. His proposals were accepted by the Calvinists and the majority of the Lutherans (1817). But after 1830 certain Lutheran ministers, chiefly in Silesia, protested against the Union; they were, in consequence, deprived and even imprisoned (1832-35); they eventually founded a separate church (1841).

A conflict broke out with the Catholic Church in the new Catholic provinces of Westphalia and the Rhine, where an opposition grew up against the Protestant office-holders. The "revolutionary" institution of civil marriage not being recognised in Prussia, the clergy kept the registers of births and deaths and had the sole right to perform the marriage ceremony. In the case of a mixed marriage, the canons of the Catholic Church forbade the clergy to marry any couple who would not pledge themselves to have their children brought up in the Catholic faith. Now a Prussian law decreed that such children should follow the religion of their father. When this law was extended to the Rhine Province in 1825, the bishops consulted the Pope, who, by a brief of 1830, sustained the canonical principle, but left a way open for the bishops to make a compromise with the government. It was arranged that the priest, without blessing the mixed marriage, was to make it possible by his *passive assistance*. This was a procedure already in use in the old Prussian duchy of Jülich (Juliers). This arrangement, at first accepted, was condemned by the new Archbishop of Cologne, then by the Polish Archbishop of Posen. The Pope sustained these prelates. The King, in anger, had them put in prison and even deposed the Archbishop of Posen.

Opening Years of Frederick William IV.'s Reign (1840-47).—The Prince Royal, at length become, in his forty-fifth year, King

Frederick William IV., was already a man of note in Germany as an orator and a patron of learning. The educated public looked to him for great reforms. He began his reign with solemn coronation ceremonies (at Koenigsberg and later at Berlin). He pardoned political prisoners, recalled Jahn, restored Arndt to his professorship, and abolished the commission for investigating the political ideas of candidates for public employment. He released and restored the imprisoned prelates. But, though speaking much and earnestly, and incessantly forming plans, he seldom reached a final decision on great questions.

He found himself drawn in one direction by his own ideals and in another by the wishes of his subjects. His own ideal he had indicated in his coronation speech. At Koenigsberg he swore to be "a just judge, a faithful prince, conscientious and merciful, a Christian King." He added, "In our country there is a union of the head and the members, of the princes and the people." At Berlin he said, "I know that I hold my crown in fief of Almighty God and that I owe Him an account of every moment of my reign. If anybody asks a guarantee for the future, I give him this sentence. It is of more weight and binds more strongly than all the coronation oaths and all the parchment pledges." Then, addressing himself directly to the crowd filling the space in front of the palace, he asked, "Will you help me to bring into even more brilliant activity the qualities whereby Prussia, with her fourteen millions of people, stands among the great powers of the world: honour, faithfulness, struggle toward light, right, and truth, stepping forward with the wisdom of age and at the same time the heroic vigour of youth? Will you . . . help me faithfully in good days as in evil ones? Oh, then, answer me with the most beautiful word of our mother-tongue, answer me a Ja! [yes]." To the loud acclaim of the crowd the King replied: "That Ja! was for me; it is my own property . . . it binds us inseparably in mutual love and fidelity."

Like his friends of the historical and romantic school, Niebuhr, Savigny, and Ranke, Frederick William hated the rationalistic and democratic French Revolution, with its popular sovereignty and its paper constitutions. His ideal was the Christian German state of the Middle Ages, as conceived by the writers of romance: the King responsible to God alone, governing in accordance with custom with the aid of his subjects grouped in their traditional classes, personally loved and respected by all, extending his paternal care to all and guiding them by divine inspiration.

The middle class and some of the nobles wished for a constitutional system. The estates of the province of Prussia, as early as 1840, entreated the King "to assure to his people an assembly of representatives of the country." The Rhine Province, neighbour to the parliamentary Kingdom of Belgium, expressed a similar wish. The question of a national representation became the leading subject of discussion in the press, the provincial bodies, and the governing class.

The King promised in 1840 a development of the provincial estates. He granted them a session once in two years, and the right of publishing their proceedings. Then he decided, with some reluctance, to summon to Berlin delegations elected by all the provincial estates, for consultation regarding a loan. The decree of 1820, fixing the limit of the debt, had declared that no new loan should be contracted without the consent of the future assembly of the estates of the kingdom. Money was now needed for construction of railway lines. The united delegations, consisting of 46 delegates of the nobles, 32 of the cities, and 20 of the peasants, approved the building of the proposed roads, but did not venture to assume the right of burdening the nation. The King, in dismissing them, took pains to remind them that they ought to regard themselves as invested with the rights of their *estate*, "not as representing the wind of opinion and the doctrines of the day!" Immediately afterward he appointed a commission to study the plan of a constitution.

The public was getting tired of waiting. The King had ordered a relaxing of the censorship (December, 1841). In 1842 engravings and books were exempted from censure. The malcontents took advantage of this to ridicule the government in cartoons, especially at Berlin and Cologne. A famous caricature appeared—the King holding in one hand an *Order*, in the other a *Counter-order*, while across his forehead the word *Disorder* was written (Frederick William IV., who died insane, already gave signs of mental derangement). The journalists were generally hot-headed young people, believers in democracy and enemies of tradition, whether aristocratic or Christian (many of them were Jews). Frederick William, wounded in his faith, did not long tolerate freedom of the press; he had Jacoby, a Jew of Königsberg, prosecuted—the result, however, was an acquittal. He suppressed two journals for "subversive tendencies" (1843) and established a court of censorship. He even compelled the University of Berlin to stop the lectures of a *privat-docent*, and in an

indignant letter against the university for allowing this "licensed revolutionist to endanger the loyalty of the students," he declared it was necessary once for all to conduct themselves according to his ideas. The Minister of Public Worship dismissed teachers suspected of being rationalists or liberals. In 1847 he turned the celebrated rationalist Diesterweg out of the principalship of a normal school at Berlin.

Opinion among educated Germans turned against the King; the poets Heine, Herweg, Freiligrath attacked him or satirized him. He became enraged against this "clique, who by speech, writings, and cartoons were laying the axe to the roots of German existence; who sought not the free superposition of the classes, but a hodge-podge of all classes" (letter to Bunsen).

The United Landtag of 1847.—By the King's direction, his confidential advisers had been considering the proper organization of States-General for the whole kingdom. In 1845 the matter was referred to a special commission. Later it was withdrawn from the commission and seriously discussed in the council of ministers. These deliberations lasted till 1847, and finally resulted in the patent of February 3 of that year. This was not the constitution awaited by the public; the King alone had signed it in order to "avoid all resemblance to a fundamental law." The patent created a United Landtag which was not, after all, the "representation of the people" promised in 1815, but only a general meeting at Berlin of all the members of the various Provincial Estates. It was composed, not of representatives of the people, but of deputies of classes. They were to sit together in considering financial questions, but for all other matters they sat as two bodies: the *curia* of seigneurs consisting of princes and great nobles (80) and the *curia* of the three inferior estates. The powers of the Landtag were limited to the voting of *new* taxes and the presentation of petitions. The King reserved the right to consult it in reference to changes of law whenever he should see fit. The gathering was not even made a settled institution, as the King declined to pledge himself to convene it periodically. He only promised to convoke, every fourth year, committees representing all the Provincial Estates, for consultation on laws, and every year a delegation consisting of one member from each province, to receive the accounts of the national debt.

The disappointment was general. All parties agreed in demanding at least a periodical meeting of the United Landtag. At the opening session of the Landtag, April 11, the King took

pains to give notice, by a solemn declaration, "that no power on earth could ever bring him to change the natural relation . . . between prince and people into one of convention or of constitution." "I shall never allow a sheet of paper drawn up as a second Providence, to be placed between God and our country, to make its paragraphs our rulers and substitute them for the ancient faithfulness. You, gentlemen, are the German Estates (*Stände*) in the old traditional sense, that is to say, you are before all the representatives and defenders of your own rights, the rights of the estates. . . . You are to exercise at once the rights the Crown has granted to you. Your mission is not to represent opinions, to give effect to the opinions of a period or of a school. That would be quite un-German as well as unfavourable to the general welfare, for it would lead to endless difficulties with the sovereign, who, according to the law of God and of the country, must govern according to his own unfettered judgment and not according to the will of majorities." Then he adjured his loyal *Estates* to help him in combatting the spirit of revolution and unbelief. Then, suddenly rising, he uttered the famous sentence from the Psalmist: "As for me and my house we will serve the Lord, yea! in truth."

The conflict between Frederick William and the *Landtag* began at once, with a show of outward respect. The assembly voted an address of thanks, reserving, however, by 484 votes against 107, "the rights of the estates"—that is to say, the right to a representation of the people promised in 1815. The King answered that, in convoking the *Landtag*, he had acted from the fulness of his kingly power and had even gone beyond the promise of his father; that he therefore refused to recognise in the *Landtag* any other right than those he had granted to it. He declared the decree of 1847 "unassailable in its main features."

The government asked for a guarantee of the railway loan. The *Landtag* refused, and proceeded to adopt a petition for liberty of the press, control of the finances, and above all a promise of periodical convocation. These requests the King refused. The *Landtag* broke up without having granted or obtained anything, June, 1847.

The "United Committees" of the Provincial Estates, summoned to Berlin for consultation regarding the Criminal Code in January, 1848, were still sitting when the King, alarmed by the prevalent agitation, decided to give way on the question of

periodic meetings of the Landtag (March 8, 1848). This tardy concession did not arrest the popular movement.

Revolution of 1848.—The revolution in Prussia was an imitation of the revolution in France; it was accomplished by a rising in the capital. At Berlin there were neither political parties nor recognised leaders, nor even organization by secret societies; but there was a discontented multitude of young men and labourers, mixed with foreigners, particularly Poles. The crowd in the city had perhaps been increased by the scarcity following the bad harvest of 1847. This multitude, already stirred up against the King, the nobles and the public officers, and inspired by a vague democratic feeling, was suddenly aroused by the news of the Paris revolution and the agitation in various German states. In Prussia herself, in the manufacturing towns of the Rhine and Silesia, great popular assemblages were meeting to prepare petitions to the King. At Berlin improvised gatherings were held in the cafés when the newspapers arrived from without. On the 7th of March a meeting held in the *Thiergarten* resolved to present a petition calling for a meeting of the Landtag.

Then began the "days of March." This was a conflict between the two sets of men holding physical force in Berlin, the revolutionists and the officers. The middle class held aloof. The officers affected to despise the crowd; they spoke of the trash. The multitude grew angry, irritated by the military measures of precaution, the massing of troops at the palace, the cannons, the sentries, the cavalry posted at the city gates. There were collisions, and several were wounded. The general wrath was directed against the Prince Royal, later Emperor William I., who was unpopular as the leader of the military and absolutist party. At the news of the Vienna revolution, a mob gathered in front of his palace (March 15). They were dispersed by the military, but without violence.

The King was beginning to yield before the storm. Like the other German princes, he seems to have had an exaggerated view of the power of the revolutionists. On the 14th of March he announced a meeting of the Landtag for the end of April, "to assist in the measures to be taken for the welfare of the German Fatherland." He promised to work for "a real regeneration of the Confederation." On the 18th, having received deputations from the provinces of the Rhine, Prussia and Silesia, he advanced the date of the meeting to April 2; at the same time he expressed the opinion that "the reorganization of the federal system could

be accomplished only by agreement of the princes with the people" and that this "necessitated a constitutional organization of all the German states." He thus sacrificed his favourite doctrine.

The proclamation was published on the morning of March 18. During the day crowds gathered before the palace shouting for the King, who thanked them from his balcony. But instead of dispersing, they remained on the spot, in spite of the summons of the officer of the guards. Then, without further ado, a fight broke out between the mob and the soldiers, who had in fact been in a state of conflict for some days. Two discharges of musketry, fired at random, caused the crowd to run away, crying Treason! Several were killed. There was a sally of the troops stationed at the palace, a volley by the infantry, and a charge by the dragoons. The mobs then pillaged the gun-shops, working-men came armed with crowbars; there was a battle near the palace; barricades were put up in the streets as in Paris. This street warfare was directed by journalists, students, and revolutionists from without. The contest went on until after midnight.

The army had little by little pushed back the rioters and was preparing to crush them on the following day. But the King suddenly faltered in presence of civil war. On the morning of the 19th a proclamation "to my dear Berliners" appeared. The King adjured his Berliners, in the name of the sick Queen, not to let themselves be seduced by a gang of malefactors; he asked them to remove the barricades, promising, if they did so, to remove the troops. The insurgents demanded that the first step should be the retirement of the troops. On the advice of the loyal citizens the King yielded. He ordered the troops to be withdrawn from the streets, granted the citizens permission to arm themselves and announced a change of ministers. The civic guard became masters of Berlin and of the government. Prince William, nicknamed *Prince Mitraille*, was ordered by the King, his brother, to leave Berlin, and departed for England. The King, through horror of bloodshed, had given the people a victory over the army.

Frederick William, abruptly renouncing his pet theories and even adopting the revolutionary terminology, assumed the part of a constitutional king at the head of a national movement. On the 21st of March, in a proclamation "to the Prussian people and the German nation," he announced himself in favour of a "true constitutional system, with responsibility of the ministers, public trials in the courts, jury in criminal cases, equality in civil and

political rights." Then, robed in the colours of the Empire (the black, red, and gold of the students), he went through Berlin on horseback, making speeches to the crowds. In the evening he exclaimed, "My people will not desert me, and Germany, confiding, will unite herself to me. Prussia henceforth is swallowed up in Germany." At one stroke the King accepted all the "revolutionary" institutions of France: a written constitution, a single national assembly elected by universal suffrage; he got the Landtag, assembled for the last time, to indorse this program by its vote.*

The National Assembly.—The Prussian National Assembly of 402 members was chosen by indirect election. Each Circle was allowed to choose a delegate; the choice was made by a body of electors who were themselves chosen by the voters—each voting district choosing one elector for every 500 inhabitants. To be a voter it was sufficient to be twenty-four years of age and to have resided in the district six months. The Assembly consisted principally of jurists, professors, and parsons, with about a hundred peasants and artisans. The most notable men in it had been members of the German Vor-parlament. Endowed, not with the power of sovereign decision on the provisions of the new constitution, but only of discussing them with the King, the Assembly found itself in continual conflict with the old governing powers—the King, the military men, and the civil officers. It lasted only seven months, but this period was decisive for the political future of Prussia. Then it was that the political parties of the kingdom took form.

The Left, coming chiefly from the democratic regions of the west and from the large cities, was a radical democratic party resembling the French republicans. It sought, French fashion, to establish sovereignty of the people; it proposed that the Assembly should declare itself sovereign, and should vote that the insurgents of March had deserved well of their country. It demanded lay control of the schools and of the *état-civil*;† also a radical reform of the administration. It came to an understanding with the Left of the Frankfort Assembly in support of a federal government for Germany superior to the state governments.

* In the province of Posen, where the Polish revolutionists had tried a resort to force in 1846, there was a Polish insurrection which required a real war for its suppression (April-May).

† That is, the registration of marriages, births, and deaths, with the attendant right of deciding on the validity of marriages and on questions of legitimacy.

In opposition to this party of revolution and German unity, there was formed a Conservative Particularist party, made up mainly from among the great landowners of the east. This party demanded the maintenance of the privileges of the aristocracy, the power of the Protestant clergy, and the independence of Prussia. It got the name of the Feudal party or, from the name of the journal it had just founded, the *Kreuzzeitung* party.

Between these two extremes, the centre formed a party of conciliation, liberal, royalist, and national: it wished a liberal constitution for Prussia and a federal union of Germany, but on such terms as to preserve the King's sovereignty and the independence of the Prussian government.

The Centre held control in the national assembly. It obtained the rejection of the propositions made by the Left and had begun voting a constitution prepared by a committee in accordance with its own views. It was a very liberal constitution, patterned after that of Belgium, the model government in the eyes of the liberals of the Rhine Province. It established legal equality and all the Belgian liberties—liberty of the person, of residence, property, religion, education, the press, meetings, clubs, petition. It abolished the survivals of seignioral authority—police, justice, and dues. The government was to be organized as in Belgium: two elective houses, summoned and dissolved by the King, controlling the finances and making the laws; the King, head of the executive power, swearing fidelity to the constitution and governing through responsible ministers; the judges independent; local administration handed over to elective councils. But instead of the Belgian property qualification for voting, universal suffrage was to be the rule, coupled with indirect election (*i. e.*, the voters, instead of voting directly for their representatives, were to choose electors to act for them). The constitution was to be agreed to by the King, as in Belgium.

The Prussian national assembly had no more power than the German national assembly of Frankfort to enforce obedience to its decisions. Its deliberations were substantially free; the Burgher guard of Berlin defended it even against a democratic outbreak in June. But the King, gradually recovering his confidence, began to show a leaning toward the Feudal party; and he had the army under his command. In the cities of Prussia there were continual quarrels between the burgher guard and the noble army officers, who were accustomed to treat civilians as their inferiors; several civilians were killed. After the affair of

Schweidnitz (July 31), in which fourteen persons were killed, the Assembly asked for a decree ordering the army officers to avoid conflicts with the citizens. The King refused the request, as an infraction of his authority over the army. The Assembly, by 219 votes against 143, repeated its request in more emphatic form (September 7). This brought on an overt breach. The King, who had appointed two liberal ministries in succession, one in March and the other in June, now dismissed his liberal advisers and formed a ministry of the old sort; he also appointed, as military commander of the province of Brandenburg, General von Wrangel, an advocate of repression by military force. Under this threat the Assembly gave a majority to the Left; it refused to insert the phrase "by the Grace of God" and voted an invitation to the federal government to defend the liberty of Vienna (see p. 416).

The people of Berlin had made the revolution following French example; the King embraced reaction following Austrian example. When the Austrian army had crushed the revolution in Vienna, Frederick William resolved to use the army against the Berlin Assembly. He formed a "fighting ministry" under his uncle, the Duke of Brandenburg, and ordered the Assembly to move to the small town of Brandenburg. The Assembly refused, and went on with its sessions at Berlin. Then the army entered the city, took possession of the hall in which the Assembly sat, and disarmed the burgher guard. Berlin was proclaimed in a state of siege; all gatherings of more than twenty persons were forbidden (November 10-12). The Assembly protested and even voted a refusal of the taxes. But between the Assembly and the army the contest was too unequal; the Assembly was broken up.

The King, having failed to win over a majority of the deputies to support Brandenburg, declared the Assembly dissolved (December 5). At the same time, invoking the traditional sovereignty of the Prussian King he proclaimed a constitution on his own authority—adding, however, that it would be subject to revision by legislative process. He also announced a meeting of the Chambers created by the instrument, to be held in Berlin.

The constitution of the 6th of December reproduced pretty closely the work of the National Assembly; but it was "granted" by the King, without the advice and consent of the nation's representatives; and one Article gave the King the right, in the absence of the two houses, to issue ordinances having the force of law. This was taken from that article of the French *Charte*

which had brought the revolution of 1830. It was put to immediate use in promulgating a law to regulate the elections to the Chambers, and even in effecting some liberal reforms—introduction of jury trial, abolition of special jurisdictions, and redemption of seigniorial dues.

The King, by retaining command of the army, had resumed his sovereign power as soon as he wished, but he did not dare any more to violate constitutional forms “desired by his people”; and he himself introduced once for all into Prussia all the revolutionary institutions condemned by his own ideal—a written constitution, popular representation, and even universal suffrage.

The Constitution of 1850.—The two Chambers, called together for the revision of the new constitution, had not time to finish their work. They got into conflict with the King, at first on the question of German unity, later on home questions. They entreated him to accept the imperial crown offered to him by the Frankfort Assembly, expressing at the same time the opinion that the constitution adopted by that assembly was valid and binding (see p. 395). Later they asked that the “state of siege” decreed for Berlin be withdrawn. On the 27th of April the King dissolved the popular chamber. In order to get a more docile Parliament he enacted, by way of ordinance, a new election law much less democratic than the one under which the dissolved Chamber was elected.

1. Universal suffrage was retained in the first stage of the elections, but it was made unequal. In each voting precinct the primary voters were divided into three classes on the basis of direct taxation, by first arranging them in a descending scale, the heaviest taxpayers at the head, the less heavy next, and so on down to those who pay the least or no tax at all; the list is then cut into three parts at such points as to have each part represent one-third of the whole direct taxation of the precinct. The taxpayers named in each part constitute a *class*, and each class chooses the same number of electors. The heavy taxpayers who constitute the first class, being few in number, are individually much more strongly represented than the crowd of poor men who constitute the third class. This “three-class system,” established provisionally by royal decree, still subsists in Prussia.

2. The voting at each of the two stages is *viva voce*, and each man’s vote is a matter of public record. The reason given by the law is that “nothing is so indispensable to a free people as the courage to express one’s conviction publicly.”

The Chamber, elected in 1850 under this law, at a time of general reaction, included about 200 office-holders in a total of 350 members. It had no will to oppose the government. It accepted the constitution, with such modifications as the King was pleased to make in it: the election law of the three classes, the re-establishment of the stamp tax on newspapers, together with the "deposit" of money as a security for good conduct, the abolition of the requirement that soldiers should swear to support the constitution, the establishment of a special court for the trial of political offences; and even Article 109, under which existing taxes continue to be collected until changed by law, a provision which reduces the power of the Chamber to the mere voting of new taxes. Regarding the composition of the upper house, no agreement was found possible; the Chamber wished to preserve some form of election, whereas the King held out for appointment. It was decided to postpone the settlement of this question till 1852.

The King then consented to promulgate the constitution (January 31, 1850). Later he swore to maintain it, but in doing so explained that he gave it his sanction only because it had been improved: "It is a condition of life that government be left possible for me, for in Prussia the King must rule, and I rule . . . because it is God's command." Thus did he come back to the doctrine of divine right and the sovereign power of the King. And yet the Constitution of 1850, by consecrating the "rights of Prussians" to liberty and equality, established a system in form democratic and liberal—more democratic than even that of Belgium. It brought Prussia into the political life of our time.

The Reaction (1850-59).—The reaction against the revolution of 1848 did not lead, in Prussia, to a restoration of the old system. Frederick William refused to imitate the *coups d'état* of the Austrian government and Napoleon III. He allowed himself to propose a plan for reducing the constitution to a *charte* and for restoring election by "estates"; but he did not dare to break his oath, and he preserved the constitution.

The contradiction between the absolutist traditions of the Prussian government and the new Constitution was surmounted in practice by devices which recall those of Napoleon III. (see p. 173). The lower house remained a representative assembly, but it was made dependent on the government. The administration, as in France, arranged the electoral districts to suit itself. It recommended to the voters candidates agreeable to the

King,—often office-holders,—and always secured the election of a large ministerial majority. The chamber of 1855 was nicknamed the “House of *Landrätke*”; it had 72 of them. (The Landrath answers roughly to the French subprefect.)

It was hardly necessary to take trouble to get so docile a representative body. The usage was established of not presenting the budget to the Parliament until after the money had been expended. The chamber voted it *en bloc* without debating the details; it simply ratified what had already been done.

The lower house, besides, had only half of the legislative power; the upper house was able to hold it in check. Now the King was no longer willing to have the elective upper house of the Belgian type, originally contemplated by the constitution. He held out for an aristocratic chamber, as in other great monarchies. He prevailed on the Chambers to give him the power of determining the composition of the body by royal ordinance (1853). The final ordinance, in 1854, created a House of Lords (*Herrenhaus*) consisting partly of hereditary and partly of life members, the whole in three categories: (1) The royal princes; (2) The hereditary nobles who formed the *curia* of seigneurs in the Landtag of 1847; (3) Life members appointed by the King at his own pleasure or on the nomination of the noble families, great landowners, universities, and cities. The number of members was not limited; it has varied from 200 to 400, but the nobles have always been in majority and have supported the King in opposition to the elected lower house.

This profound transformation of the constitution, contrary to the very terms of the original and made by mere ordinance, was never ratified by a regular law; so several commentators on Prussian constitutional law regard the *Herrenhaus* as unconstitutional. It has nevertheless remained a part of the legislature, equal in power with the elected house. The Prussian Parliament was given no collective name in the Constitution of 1850. The King proposed the old historical name of Landtag. This proposal the lower house rejected (1855); but the King would not have the French name of “Chambers.” The ministry adopted, for daily practice, the name of Landtag, which has become the established designation.

The press, which the constitution declared to be free, was stifled with prosecutions and threats. A member of the Landtag was prosecuted for inciting the people against the *Junkers*

(squires). The *Voter's Journal* was confiscated as often as three days in a week.

The right of holding political meetings was suspended; even the religious meetings of dissenting Protestants were forbidden. Political clubs were dissolved; the government prevented the holding of gatherings in the beer-gardens by withdrawing the license of any beer-seller who allowed his premises to be used for such purposes. Certain democrats, accused of conspiracy, were kept in prison eight months without trial.

This system rested on an alliance between the court, the great landowners, the military men, and the Orthodox party. The King, the ministers, and the *Kreuzzeitung*, the official organ of the Court, declared it was necessary to re-establish the autocratic power of the Crown, the influence of the aristocracy, and the reign of religion. The King, in receiving a deputation in Silesia, reproached the inhabitants with "following the example of the large cities," and he threatened them with his displeasure if agitations were begun again. "There is in the cities an evil spirit," said he. At Elbing, in 1853, he censured "those municipal authorities who, following demoralizing and de-Christianizing tendencies, still worship the unclean and corrupting conquests of a shameful epoch." Stahl, rector of the University of Berlin, in a famous toast, declared: "Science must face about." He reproached it with having been "in conflict with the facts of life and especially with its controlling forces."

The nobles obtained a modification of the constitution as regards the abolition of their privileges. The institution of *fide commissa* was restored in 1852, which enabled them to keep up the entail of their lands; and in 1856 landowners were given the police jurisdiction of their domains. Above all, the remodelling of the administrative arrangements of the provinces, Circles, and communes was arrested; the laws already passed, which had made a beginning of the work, were repealed. The provincial estates, the old assemblies of the Circles, and the administration of the communes by the nobles, as before 1850, were all restored.

Prussia found herself again under the administration of royal officers and the landholding nobility, and under the personal government of the King and ministers—disguised by a democratic representative system, as in France at the same period.

This system lasted until Frederick William IV., so far touched in his mind as to have become incapable of business, handed over the government to his brother, first as Lieutenant (October,

1858) and later as Regent. William swore to maintain the constitution and chose ministers favourable to reform; but he took pains to announce publicly that no change of system was to be looked for: "what has been promised shall be performed, what has not been promised shall be withheld."

Prussia's German Policy.—Throughout this whole period, since 1814, Prussia had laboured to extend her influence over the rest of Germany. Like Austria, she was at once a great European power and a member of the German Federation for a part of her territory. But Austria had only a small minority of German subjects (8,000,000 in 36,000,000) and her German districts touched the rest of Germany only at one corner—the southwest. Prussia, on the other hand, peopled almost exclusively by Germans, was composed of provinces which spread across the whole Federation, bordering on twenty-eight other states and intimately connected with the economic life of all parts of Germany. Being thus so much more German than Austria, she was in a position to lay the foundation for eventual leadership of the union. To this end she employed three sets of agencies—military, political, and commercial.

She had the best army in Germany, the defence of half of the western frontier, supposed to be threatened by France; she also had garrisons in certain federal fortresses. As early as 1815 she had asked that the Diet should grant her the command-in-chief of the troops of the other North German states, Austria to have the command of those of South Germany. But except during the critical years when fear of a French invasion gave Prussia a passing influence over the threatened states (1830, 1840, 1848), the other governments steadily opposed a measure which would have given Prussia military control. So the federal army remained decentralized.

As to political leadership, the King of Prussia left that to Austria till 1848; and when the revolutionary Assembly of Frankfort tendered it to Frederick William IV., under the title of Emperor, he refused it, because it had not been offered "by his equals" (see p. 395). Now the princes of Germany, especially those of them who bore the title of King, would not willingly place themselves under the King of Prussia, whom they accused of wishing to aggrandize himself at their expense. They preferred to support the Emperor, their traditional superior, who had no eye to annexations nor to a closer union of Germany.

The Zollverein.—It was neither through military nor political

measures, but through commerce, that the unity of Germany under Prussian leadership began. The first form of unity was the *Zollverein* or Customs Union, instituted and directed by Prussia. It was formed slowly, in the face of resistance which, general at first, became gradually weaker as the various states perceived the material advantages it offered. It was begun in 1818, but was not completed until 1853.

It originated in the extremely depressed economic condition of Prussia after 1815, which made a radical reform of her tariff necessary. The several parts of the kingdom had never before been under one and the same tariff; each district had a customs system of its own; in fact, Prussia had 67 different tariff areas. Her territory, cut into two widely separated divisions, made up of fragments interspersed with lands belonging to other states, would have been hard to encircle with custom houses; the complicated nature as well as the length of the frontiers (over 4000 miles) would have made smuggling easy.

Maassen, the officer charged with arranging the customs affairs, succeeded in setting up a common tariff and a single administration for the whole kingdom (1818). Foreseeing the impossibility of preventing smuggling by direct means, he chose the plan of making it unprofitable, by setting a low scale of duties: ten per cent. on manufactured products which might be imported at all points on the frontiers; twenty per cent. on colonial or over-sea products, which could only be brought in through ports easily guarded. In order to avoid disputes as to the valuation of goods, as well as the temptation to show false invoices, he adopted specific duties as far as possible, instead of the *ad valorem* method. Prussia was thus constrained, by her defective frontiers, to adopt the most liberal commercial policy of all Europe. No other great state, at that time of trade restrictions, had a tariff so nearly approaching free trade.

In establishing her line of custom houses, Prussia was led to include within it the inclosed territories belonging to the petty princes of Thuringia. She offered these princes to share the revenue collected on the basis of population; at first they protested against the tyranny of Prussia, and brought the matter before the Federal Diet; but in the end they accepted the arrangement. The first treaty, with Schwarzburg-Sonderhausen (1819), served as a model for the treaties with the other states whose territory was inclosed within Prussia. The inclosed state entered for good and all into the Prussian customs system, accepting the Prus-

sian tariff and the collection by Prussian officers, and receiving of the proceeds a share proportioned to its share of the total population contributing to the revenue. For the smaller state the arrangement was financially advantageous.

The Prussian government sought to negotiate treaties with the southern and central states, but for some time the princes rejected every proposition of Prussia as an attack on their independence. They preferred to make local customs unions among themselves. From 1820 to 1828 there were negotiations between the central states, between the Rhenish states, and between Bavaria and Wurtemberg. Austria, which clung to her prohibitive system, would neither admit the German states to a customs union with herself nor consent to their entering a union with Prussia.

Finally, after some years of intrigue, Prussia, having failed to win over her nearest neighbours, made a treaty directly with Hesse-Darmstadt, which, with its divided territory, found itself isolated in the west. The agreement, in this case, was a bad financial operation for Prussia. Hesse-Darmstadt, for a territory of only 3000 square miles, brought her a customs frontier of 500 miles. But the government accepted it from motives of policy, to create a precedent. The treaty of 1828 with Hesse-Darmstadt became, in fact, a pattern for the later customs treaties with the other German states. In order to soothe the sovereignty of the smaller states, these treaties were given the form of a customs union (Zollverein), the two contracting parties standing on a footing of equality in each case. The two states were to abolish all customs duties in their trade with each other, and to have a common tariff in their trade with foreign countries. Each was to administer this common tariff on its own part of the common frontier, each was to send an agent to watch the customs administration of the other. But Prussia, in every case, prevailed on the other to adopt the Prussian tariff and her excise taxes on tobacco, also her commercial treaties with foreign countries; in a word, Prussia controlled the customs union. The treaties were made for six years only, at the end of which term each state regained liberty of action.

In competition with the Prussian union in the north a southern customs league was formed by Bavaria and Wurtemberg; also a commercial union of central Germany (1828). But the southern and northern leagues, threatened with separation by the establishment of a barrier between, took measures against their common enemy, the central union, and succeeded in detaching

from it two little states, with the result of opening a passage through the line that threatened to separate them. Thereupon the Central Union broke up; Hesse-Cassel joined the Zollverein (1831), the southern states followed, and finally most of the other states. By 1836 the greater part of Germany had joined the Prussian *Zollverein*. The method was by separate treaties, for a term of years, between Prussia and each of the states. The *Zollverein* included 25,000,000 of people, and its frontier was less extended than that of Prussia in the days when she stood alone. The only states remaining outside were Mecklenburg, the four Free Cities, and the states of the northwest (Hanover, Brunswick, Oldenburg), which formed a separate union with a lower tariff than the Zollverein.

The Zollverein brought so manifest benefits that, in spite of the dislike of the other governments for Prussia, the treaties, at their expiration, were renewed for twelve years—to run till 1853.

In 1850, after the unsuccessful attempt of Prussia to form a new political union, the German princes made preparations to go out of the Zollverein, in order to form a customs union with Austria on the basis of a higher tariff: they found the Prussian tariff not sufficiently protectionist. Prussia was not willing to follow them in joining Austria; she turned to the states of the northwest, which had stood aloof from the Zollverein because they regarded its scale of duties as too high for their trade with England. With these she formed a customs union, consenting to lower her tariff for the purpose. The old *Zollverein* seemed to be broken up (1852). But the former members of it failed, after all, in their negotiations with Austria, and in the year 1853 revived their treaties with Prussia for another twelve years.

The *Zollverein*, by a series of special temporary treaties, had almost realized the commercial union which the Diet had failed to establish. All the German states, except Austria, were now members of it.

BIBLIOGRAPHY.

BIBLIOGRAPHY.—**Dahlmann-Waitz**, "*Quellenkunde der Deutschen Gesch.*," 1894 ed. (On this work and the character given to the bibl. of this chapter, see note to bibl. to chap. xii.)

DOCUMENTS.—The principal official documents are the *Reports* of the assemblies of 1848 (see **Waitz**, 1894 edit., Nos. 6081–82,) and the *Gesetzsammlung* (official collection of Prussian laws).

Of the letters and recollections, the most instructive are: **Hardenberg**, 5 vols., 1877.—**Friedrich Wilhelm IV.**, 1873, correspondence with his friend

Bunsen. (Extracts in **S.-R. Taillandier**, "Dix Ans de l'Hist. d'Allemagne," 1875.)—**Th. von Bernhardi**, vol. i., ii., 1893.

WORKS.—The chief complete history is **Treitschke**, "Deutsche Gesch.," 5 vols., 1886-95, stops at 1848 (see bibl. to chap. xii.); it tells the secret history of the government from documents in the Prussian archives; very Prussian, and very partial to Frederick William III.—Summary in **Bulle**, see chap. xii.—Excellent articles in the "Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie."

In French: **Veron**, "Hist. de la Prusse," popular edit.

ON REFORMS FROM 1807 TO 1814: See the monographs on reformers: **Pertz**, "Leben des . . . Fr. von Stein," 6 vols., 1849-55, exaggerates the rôle of his hero.—**Seeley**, "Life and Times of Stein," 3 vols., 1880.—(Summaries in **Cavaignac**, "Formation de la Prusse Contemp.," 1891).—**Lehmann**, "Scharnhorst," 2 vols., 1886-87.—**Oncken**, "Zeitalter der Revolution," vol. ii., 1887 (Oncken coll.).

ON THE HISTORY OF INSTITUTIONS: **Von Ronne**, "Staatsrecht der Preussischen Monarchie," 4 vols., 1st edit., 1856-63, 4th ed., 1881; description both juridical and historical of all Prussian institutions, the most complete work of this nature; the first edition is preferable, as it describes the system previous to the transformations of 1867.—**Bornhak**, "Gesch. des Preussischen Verwaltungsrechts," 4 vols., 1884-92.—**Grant Duff**, "Studies in European Politics," has excellent chapters on German affairs under the Confederation.—**Malet**, "Overthrow of the Germanic Confederation."

ON SOCIAL AND POLITICAL LIFE: **v. Bulow-Cummerow**, "Preussen, seine Verfassung . . .," 2 vols., 1842-43, aristocratic.—**F. Fischer**, "Preussen am Abschlusse der Ersten Hälfte des XIX^{ten} Jahrhunderts," 1876, liberal.—**K. Hillebrand**, "La Prusse Contemp. et ses Institutions," 1867.

ON THE PEASANT EMANCIPATION: **J.-F. Knapp**, "Die Bauernbefreiung . . . Preussens," 2 vols., 1887, an accurate study of the condition of the peasants.

ON THE ZOLLVEREIN: **W. Weber**, "Der Deutsche Zollverein," 1869.—Bibl. in "Handwörterbuch der Staatswissenschaften."—In English, **Bowring's** "Report on the Russian Commercial Union," Eng. Parl. Doc., 1840.—**Rand's** "Selections in Economic History," 1888.

CHAPTER XV.

ESTABLISHMENT OF GERMAN UNITY.

GERMANY, kept in the helpless condition of the Federation by the rivalry between Prussia and Austria, has become a nation by the victory of Prussia. The creation of the new Empire was made possible by a series of struggles and transformations. But during this period of preparation (1859-71) the history of Prussia is so closely interwoven with that of the other German states that it will be advantageous to make one narrative of the whole.

Reform of the Prussian Army (1859-62).—The Prince Royal of Prussia, regent since 1858, became, in January, 1861, at the age of sixty-three, King William I. Very unpopular with the Prussian liberals as head of the Prussian military party, he had always taken a great interest in the army. From the moment that he became master of the government, he set himself to reorganize the Prussian military system.

The law of 1814 had established in principle the universal three-year service in the active army; but although the population had increased meanwhile from 12,000,000 to 18,000,000, the size of the army had hardly been changed. The number of possible recruits had risen from about 40,000 a year to about 63,000; but as the number of actual soldiers for whom pay and outfit were provided was only about 130,000, the practice was to enlist only a part of the young men each year, and to turn most of them over to the reserve after two years of active service. That is to say, the two principles of universal military drill, and service for three years with the colours, had been abandoned in practice. As service in the reserve was for two years only, this body was insufficient, if called out, to raise the whole army to its war-footing of 400,000 men. To complete it, men of the *Landwehr*, that is to say, fathers of families, would have to be called out. Now the *Landwehr* was not up to the standard of the active army, and a call upon it for service would impose heavy sacrifices on the people.

King William accomplished two reforms: 1. He re-established the universal service, and for the three full years. This raised

the active army to nearly 200,000 men. 2. He lengthened the period of service in the reserve from two to four years. On the other hand he provided that the men should retire from the *Landwehr* at the age of thirty-two, instead of forty, the previous rule. The three years' service in the active army and the four years in the reserve, covering for the young men the years from twenty to twenty-seven, sufficed to yield an army of 440,000 men without calling on the *Landwehr*. The change gave an army consisting of men at once younger and better drilled than the old practice. But for these reforms more officers and more money were necessary.

The King took advantage of the mobilization of the Prussian army during the Italian war of 1859; of the *Landwehr* battalions called out at that juncture, he retained the officers in service after the men in the ranks were dismissed. But the money necessary for paying these officers had only been voted for one year. The King proposed to the Landtag a bill for reorganizing the army and at the same time asked for an increase of the land-tax to cover the expense. The Lower House disliked the proposed lengthening of military service from two years to three; the Upper House disliked the land-tax. The government had to be satisfied with a compromise: the two houses renewed for one year the vote of money to maintain provisionally and complete the measures necessary to the existing war-footing and to the enlarged army (May, 1860).

In spite of the word "provisionally," inserted as an amendment by the Lower House, the government acted on the assumption that the reorganization of the army was a settled fact. It transformed provisional battalions into regular regiments with numbers and colours. The Chamber continued to vote the additional money with the declaration that it was merely provisional.

The Prussian House of Representatives had not the same practical power as the representative bodies in other parliamentary states of western Europe. Recently created by a revolutionary movement, it had been reduced by the absolutist reaction to the position of a mere consulting and registering body. Its constitutional right of passing laws and voting taxes was confined to rejecting bills and new taxes proposed by the government. It had no means of putting effective pressure on the ministers and their subordinates, who remained the real holders of power.

King William, at his accession, had accepted the constitution, but he interpreted it as a rule of procedure for the conduct of

public affairs, not as a contract between the King and the people. He still held the King to be invested with a higher power of divine origin, which gave him the right and the duty of directing the government, and in particular the army and the foreign policy. It was in substance the Tory doctrine of the Divine Right, re-enforced by the Hohenzollern tradition which made the King the hereditary head of the army (Kriegsherr).

Nevertheless Regent William's course had reassured the liberals. He had discarded the feudal party who had surrounded his brother and had taken his ministers from among the supporters of the constitution. The reaction of 1850 had exhausted itself, and the constitution was safely established. A "new era" was beginning. It showed itself in the elections of 1858, which returned a strong majority of constitutional liberals. This majority tried to act in harmony with the ministers of the new era, who, on their part, brought forward a liberal reform—a permissive civil marriage bill (the *Herrenhaus* rejected it). The Lower House avoided a renewal of the conflict regarding the army question by voting the additional supplies; but in 1861 this was done by a majority of eleven only, and with a reduction in the amount proposed by the ministry.

William, on becoming King in 1861, delivered some utterances which showed the growing breach between him and the liberals. The proclamation "to my people" reproduced, with commendation, the saying of his predecessor in 1847: "As for me and my House, we will serve the Lord." At the public coronation in Königsberg he convoked the two Houses of the Landtag, and took pains to explain to them his doctrine of the divine right: "The Kings of Prussia receive their crown from God. I shall therefore take my crown to-morrow from the Lord's table and place it on my head." He did in fact take it from the communion table, and made the further declaration: "I am the first King to mount the throne since it was surrounded with modern institutions; but not forgetting that the crown comes only from God, I have shown . . . that I have received it from his hands" (October, 1861).

Formation of the Progress Party (1861-62).—Between William I., King by divine right, and the liberal majority in the House of Representatives, a conflict began which lasted, in the acute form, for four years. For the elections of 1861 a new German-Progress party was formed. In its electoral address it declared itself squarely opposed to the ministers both in their do-

mestic policy and in their German policy. In home affairs the party demanded the completion of the "Constitutional State" by establishing the responsibility of public officers—that is to say, the right of prosecuting them before the courts. (This was at that time one of the favourite demands of all the liberal parties on the Continent; a law on ministerial responsibility was mentioned in the Prussian Constitution, but had not yet been enacted.) They also demanded a reform of local and provincial administration abolishing the privileges of the great landowners; a reform of the public schools making them independent of the clergy; civil marriage; right of jury trial in press cases; two years' service in the army, so as to reduce the cost to the nation. And above all, in order to make the other reforms possible, they demanded a "radical reform of the House of Lords, the enemy of all progress." In German affairs the party demanded a close union of Germany, with a strong central power in the hands of Prussia, and a representation of the people of all Germany. In other words, they advocated a return to the program of 1849. The Progress party (*Fortschrittspartei*) set itself in array against three powers in the state—the official class, the aristocracy, and the clergy.

The Feudal party replied in a purely negative manifesto, rejecting all the demands of the Progressists. The liberal majority of the retiring deputies advised the avoidance of hasty action.

In the Chamber elected in 1861 the Progress party had control. It had carried the large towns and the manufacturing provinces—Saxony, Silesia, and the Rhine Province. The old liberal party was reduced to a small minority. Between these two parties the Left Centre adhered to the Progress party in the struggle.

The House assumed a decided attitude toward the ministers. It refused to continue the provisional vote of money for the additions to the army. It demanded a regular budget with the items in detail, and a stoppage of the practice of using money for a different purpose than the one for which it was granted. The ministry offered its resignation; the King preferred to dissolve the House, and in March, 1862, he appointed a "fighting ministry," under Hohenlohe.

The Conflict Regarding the Constitution (1862-66).—The struggle had begun between the House of Representatives, on behalf of the people, and the King, supported by the ministers and the House of Lords. It related primarily to a practical

question. The voters wished to maintain the two years' military service which had been in use for a score of years and seemed sufficient for the defence of the country. They were averse to increasing taxes in order to support a heavier military burden. Their wish was so decided that they were ready to resist even the King: neither dissolution nor royal manifesto could move them. Twice, in 1862 and again in 1863, they re-elected the Progressists. The King held tenaciously by his project of army reform; he thought it a necessity and regarded his own judgment as final on a military question. He denied the right of the House of Representatives to refuse him the money needed for fulfilling his duty as head of the army. He had thoughts of abdicating, but none of accepting the two years' service.

This conflict on a practical question raised a conflict of doctrine that was new in the history of Prussia. The King, up to that time, had always decided questions of the army organization on his own sovereign judgment. If he declared a reform necessary, could the houses refuse him the money required for the purpose? William I. had, by implication, started the question by *definitively* creating new regiments, for which the Chambers had granted him only a *provisional* appropriation. But, on the other hand, if the House was under compulsion to vote every appropriation demanded as necessary by the King, it lost the sole effective right which the constitution gave it—the right to impose the taxes; it would become on those terms a mere consultative body.

The ministry represented the conflict as one for the possession of power; the question was "whether the power of the government should remain in the hands of the Crown . . . or should pass to the Chamber of Deputies." The circular to the administrative officers instructing them how to influence the voters, spoke of the opposition between the King's government and the "democratic party," which was exerting itself to establish "the so-called Parliamentary government" by "transferring the centre of gravity of public power from the Crown to the representatives of the people." The Progressives defended themselves from the charge of attacking the constitutional rights of the Crown; the question to be decided was "whether, side by side with the great power of the government, the constitutional right of the people's representatives should have a meaning or not."

The question was not, therefore, as in France in the time of Charles X., squarely presented in the form of a conflict between

a constitutional system and a parliamentary system. The point was not whether the King or the House should ordinarily have the last word. The two opposing parties were not agreed in saying what the question really was. The King said it was whether the system of the constitution was to be maintained against an attempt at a parliamentary system; the Chamber said it was defending the constitution against an absolutist pretension. A fact which muddled the question was that the House drew its powers from the Constitution of 1850, a copy of a foreign constitution which was founded on the sovereignty of the people, and that the King held his from the traditional military monarchy. If between these two powers, springing from contradictory sources, a conflict arose, neither the constitution nor tradition indicated a method of settling it.

The King dissolved the House (1862); but the Progressists were re-elected, and in sufficient number to supply a majority of their own. The former ministerial liberals disappeared.

The ministry attempted to conciliate the majority by some concessions in foreign policy; it recognised the new Kingdom of Italy and it intervened in Hesse-Cassel. It also made some vague promises of concessions regarding the army. But after long negotiations, the House, by 308 votes against 10, refused to continue the appropriation provisionally voted in the preceding years, for carrying out the army reorganization.

The King hesitated, was inclined to abdicate, even drew up his act of abdication, but later called on Bismarck and charged him to form a fighting ministry (*un ministère de combat*). Bismarck, a gentleman of Brandenburg, had distinguished himself as early as 1847 by his hatred of Parliamentary government and his devotion to the absolute monarchy. He had protested, in 1849, against introducing into monarchical Prussia the constitutional arrangements of the west, particularly against Parliamentary control of the budget. He accepted the leadership of the government with a pledge never to yield.

Bismarck came into power with a policy already marked out, which he expressed, in conversation with the members of the budget committee, in symbolical terms: "We are fond of carrying a suit of armour too stout for our lean body, so we ought to make use of it." He also said: "It is not Prussia's liberalism that Germany looks to, but her military power." "The unity of Germany is to be brought about, not by speeches nor by votes of majorities, but by *blood and iron*." As Prussian envoy at the

Diet he had learned to despise the Confederation, in which Prussia was always outvoted; he wished to see it broken up. He looked forward to a war with Austria; and for this war, which must decide the fate of Germany, he wished the Prussian army to be powerful and capable of rapid movement. He stood for the reorganization, therefore, as strongly as the King.

By intrusting the government to so noted a representative of the Junker party, the King broke once for all with the Chamber. When Bismarck presented himself before the Budget Committee with an olive branch, plucked by him at Avignon, this symbol of conciliation was looked upon as derisive. The Chamber raised the constitutional question. It abandoned the practice of continuing provisionally the expenditures of the preceding year, without having voted them; and it declared it "contrary to the constitution that the government should make an expenditure rejected by the Chamber." The ministry answered by carrying its budget to the House of Lords, which passed it by an enormous majority. The Lower House declared this action null and void, as contrary to the constitution, as the budget must be voted in the first place by the people's representatives (October, 1862).

The House relied on the formal text in asserting that the ministers had violated the constitution.* Bismarck urged in reply the theory of an omission in the constitution. He admitted that the ministry was about to be "forced to manage the budget without the basis prescribed by the constitution"; but he contended that he was in duty bound to "cover the expenses necessary for maintaining the institutions of the state and the welfare of the country." The constitution, he argued, contained no provision for the case. The omission could be supplied only by recurring to the law as it stood before the Constitution of 1850. Now in Prussia the old law admitted the unlimited power of the King; the King then must have the power of adopting the budget. The Constitution of 1850 had established three legislative powers, the King, the Chamber of Deputies, and the House of Lords, and had given all three equal power, even in budget matters. No one of the three had the right of forcing the others to yield. For the case of disagreement the constitution provided

* "All the revenues and expenditures of the state shall be annually estimated in advance and set down in the budget; the budget is fixed annually by a law" (Article 99). "The taxes and dues for the treasury of the state can only be levied as they are set down in the budget or ordained by special laws" (Article 100).

no solution; it assumed an agreement by compromises. "If compromises are out of the question because one of the powers insists on its own will with a doctrinaire absolutism, then . . . instead of compromises we have conflicts; and as the life of the state cannot be arrested, the conflicts become questions of force" (1863). This saying, twisted by Bismarck's opponents, became the famous formula "Force beats law."

The struggle became a conflict of forces. Now the House had only the moral force of public opinion and the legal right of voting the budget. The ministry, supported by the King, had the physical force of the army and the machinery for levying the taxes. The ministry went on with its own idea. It remained in office three years, acting on an unconstitutional budget, irregularly voted by the House of Lords. It got the Lower House dissolved again in 1863; but the Progressives came back with a still stronger majority. The ministry was not moved; it only gave up presenting the budget to the House, and cut the sessions of the Landtag as short as possible. Against its opponents it copied the methods of Napoleon III. (see pp. 000-00).

Official candidacy, already tried in 1862 in the form of a circular to the officials, was openly established. An order was issued by the King, declaring that the oath of fealty and obedience taken by officials required them "to follow as voters the course indicated by the King."

Against the journals the government suspended liberty of the press as given by the constitution, and established the system of *notifications*. The government assumed the right of notifying any paper dangerous to "the public welfare," and of suppressing it after two notifications. It said in explanation that it was necessary to forbid all criticism of the acts of the government. The chief liberal newspapers were suppressed or reduced to silence. The government proceeded against the elective municipalities by refusing to install the officers-elect, naming in their stead commissioners of their own appointment—a thing which had never been done in Prussia since the establishment of the municipalities.

To this government pressure the people and their representatives could oppose nothing but displays of public opinion. The House of Representatives voted addresses, which the King declined to receive; it protested against the press ordinance as contrary to the constitution; it voted an inquiry into the pressure put upon the elections, but the government prevented the in-

quiry; it passed a bill to enforce the responsibility of ministers (1863). The municipal councils presented petitions, but were fined for their action; the cities organized meetings, which the government prohibited; they refused to celebrate the royal anniversaries.

All through these years the House was protesting against the foreign policy of Bismarck—the convention with Russia for the extradition of Polish refugees (1863), the Schleswig-Holstein expedition (1864), and the war with Austria (1866).

The National-Liberal Agitation in Germany (1859-64).—In the other states of Germany political life had been awakened again, as in Prussia, by the Italian war. In 1859 Germany emerged from the absolutist and states-rights reaction and entered a period of agitations at once liberal and national. It was a time of confusion and conflict. The individual governments wished to keep up the autocratic system, while their subjects were demanding a return to the constitutional ideas of 1848. The governments were bent on maintaining their separate sovereignty; the national parties demanded the unity of Germany. Almost everywhere there was a national-liberal party contending against a state-rights autocratic party. But the supporters of union were divided, some wishing Prussia, others Austria, to be at the head. There was, then, internal conflict in each state both on a domestic constitutional question, and at the same time on the national question; conflict in the federal government between the two great powers, and conflict between their supporters throughout Germany.

In the domestic conflict of the various states, the elected Chamber contended with the official body in the name of the constitution or of liberty. The most famous of these conflicts took place in Hesse-Cassel regarding the Constitution of 1831, unlawfully suppressed in 1849. The elector was compelled to re-establish it, under threats from the other sovereigns.

On the national question, since the fear had arisen that Napoleon III. might attack Germany, there was a general agreement that a reform of the Confederation was needed to make it capable of resisting foreign attack. But as to the precise reform to be made, there was the same disagreement as in 1848. The reformers were still face to face with two insoluble questions: 1. Who should have the leadership? The King of Prussia would enter no union in which he should not be the head; the other kings would not hear of the King of Prussia. 2. What coun-

tries should belong to the union? Austria would come in only on condition of bringing in her whole empire; the Germans were unwilling to admit the un-German parts of it. The parties of 1848—the Prussian party, or *Kleindeutsche*, and the Austrian party, or *Grossdeutsche*—were therefore still at the force.

Two political clubs had sprung up representing these two conflicting policies. The National Union, founded in 1859, on the model of the Italian Union, to labour for the union of Germany, proposed a close federation, with an assembly of representatives under the presidency of Prussia, according to the plan of Union projected in the year 1850. This club was controlled by former members of the Gotha Reunion, chiefly professors, and had its strength in northern Germany. The Reform Club, started in 1862, advocated a looser federation, with a collective *directory* and a chamber composed of delegates from the local legislatures, in such manner as to let Austria come in. This club had its strength in southern Germany, especially Bavaria.

The agitation carried on by these clubs, in these years of re-awakening public life, of patriotic festivals and scientific congresses, forcibly attracted the attention of the educated classes and even disquieted the state governments. Several of these forbade their subjects to join the "National Union." But the real decision of the great question lay with the two leading German states.

The Austrian government, which had just established a constitutional system in its own empire, had on its side the majority of the German princes, enemies of the King of Prussia. These had met in conference as early as 1859, at Wurzburg, and had proposed a scheme of reform for the confederation. This had been discussed, in a leisurely way, during the three subsequent years. Prussia rejected it in 1860. Austria accepted the general principle of it in 1861, and, after long negotiations, finally convened a Congress of the Princes at Frankfort, in August, 1863. This body adopted the Austrian plan of reforms: a Directory of six members—Austria, Prussia, Bavaria, and three other states in alternation; a Federal Council of 21 votes, in which a two-thirds majority should be necessary for making war; an Assembly of 302 delegates from the legislatures of the different states; and a Federal Tribunal. Twenty-four princes signified their acceptance of the plan. But without the adhesion of Prussia it was impossible, and Prussia refused.

Bismarck would hear no more of a confederation to which

Austria belonged and in which she was sure to hold Prussia in check; he wished to replace it with a new union under Prussian leadership, without Austria. As early as 1862 he declared to the Austrian ambassador that Austria ought to withdraw from Germany and "transfer her centre of gravity to Ofen"—that is, to Hungary. In communicating the refusal of Prussia to take part in the Congress of Princes, he twice explained his own project of union (January and August, 1863): instead of a confederation, a *union*, with a military system and a treasury of its own; instead of a collective Directory, a single head, the King of Prussia; instead of a meeting of delegates of the legislatures, an Assembly of Representatives of the people, chosen by direct election, in proportion to population,—“the sole legitimate organ of the German nation,”—a necessary agent for overcoming the resistance of the state governments. This was the old revolutionary scheme of 1849.

A meeting of liberal members of the legislatures of the different states, and a general gathering of the “National Union” (September-October, 1862), had just declared for the Constitution of 1849. It seemed, then, that the national party throughout Germany was going to support Prussia, which was resuming her old program. In 1861 the “National Union,” in its manifesto, had declared that Germany needed Prussia and that they must “push Prussia along the right road.” But the German patriots were at the same time liberals, and the hostility of King William’s government to liberalism made them despair of Prussia. When Bismarck published his scheme of reform, they did not believe him to be sincere: they thought him a champion of autocracy and of Prussia, like his party. A portion of the German liberals turned toward Austria, at that time governed by a liberal German minister; the Emperor, when on his way to the Congress of Princes, in 1863, was received with popular demonstrations in the cities of Southern Germany.

As regards the German princes, most of the greater ones were still hostile to Prussia. Hardly any were for her except her little neighbours in the north, and Baden in the south. In the crisis that had come on Germany, the great majority both of governments and subjects were going to take part against Prussia.

Crisis of the Duchies (1864-66).—Bismarck announced that the question of union would be solved only by force. He was therefore preparing for war both by military measures and diplomacy. He needed an army capable of winning prompt victories, and so

was maintaining the reorganization of the Prussian army at the cost of a quarrel with the whole nation. He needed the support or the neutrality of the great European powers, for in the European balance of power Germany had been treated as a country without a master, where all Europe had the right of intervention. The key of success therefore lay in diplomacy. Bismarck was above all a diplomatist—a diplomatist of the new school which, breaking with the polite forms and smooth falsehoods of usage, went on the plan of saying exactly what was to be done. He manœuvred in such a way as to isolate Austria; he won Russia to his side by aiding her against the Poles; France, by letting Napoleon believe that he would help him in annexing territory; Italy, by the promise of Venetia. As for England, he saw that, for a Continental war, her support could be dispensed with.

The union of Germany was accomplished, as he foretold, by blood and iron, in three wars: with Denmark in 1864, with Austria in 1866, and with France in 1870-71.

The war with Denmark arose from a disputed succession to the crown of the duchies of Schleswig and Holstein. The contest was between Christian, the new King of Denmark, and Frederick Duke of Augustenburg. The settlement decreed in 1852 by the great powers of Europe in favour of Christian, had not been ratified by the German Diet nor by the assemblies of the "estates" representing the people of the two duchies, nor by the heir of the Duke of Augustenburg. Of the German powers, Austria and Prussia alone had pledged themselves. When, in 1863, the throne became vacant by the death of Frederick VII. of Denmark, the assemblies of the duchies proclaimed the accession of Frederick VIII., the Augustenburg candidate; Holstein, whose population was purely German, and Schleswig, where, except in the north, the great majority was German, announced their separation from Denmark in order to unite with Germany. The question of the duchies thus became a national question. German patriots took up the cause of the Germans in the duchies and the German prince Frederick VIII. against the Danish foreigners.

It was at first a patriotic popular movement. The two great political clubs opened subscriptions, and enrolled volunteers in order to expel the Danes. In December, 1863, acting in concert, they called a congress of members of the state legislatures, which named a committee of thirty-six to direct the movement in favour of the independence of the duchies. The legislatures of the dif-

ferent states were urging on their governments, obliging them to recognise Frederick VIII. and then to vote in the Diet to send a federal "army of execution" to Holstein, where a government had been formed in the name of Frederick VIII. (December, 1863).

Prussia and Austria opposed this move, though it was urged by their elected Chambers. They asked that the appeal of the Duke of Augustenburg be rejected by the Diet, and even that the committee of thirty-six be dispersed. The other states declined this course. Germany was dividing into two camps: on the one side, the governments of the two great powers which were for recognising King Christian as successor to the ducal crown, on condition of establishing only a personal union between the duchies and Denmark; on the other side all the other governments and all the liberals, including those of Prussia and Austria.

Bismarck, without concerning himself about public opinion, induced Austria to join him in the opposition to the action of the Diet. Austria and Prussia called on the King of Denmark to give Schleswig an independent government, and on his refusal decided on war (January, 1864). This was a distinct war from that decreed, by way of federal execution, by the Diet. The Prussian and Austrian armies occupied the two duchies without a battle, compelling the federal army of execution to withdraw (this was composed of Saxon and Hanoverian troops). The war was fought in Danish territory. While it was going on Prussia and Austria declared that the only solution was the recognition of Frederick of Augustenburg (May, 1864). But at the treaty of peace (August, 1864) they compelled Christian to cede his claims to the duchies, not to the Duke of Augustenburg, but to the King of Prussia and the Emperor of Austria. They took possession by instituting a *provisional* administration controlled by a joint commission of two members, one Prussian, the other Austrian.

As to the final disposition of the duchies, the two governments were unable to agree. They did not yet dare to cast aside the claims of the Duke of Augustenburg, indorsed by themselves in May, 1864, and still sustained by public opinion in Germany and in the duchies. But before allowing the Duke to come into possession, Prussia demanded the entry of the duchies into the *Zollverein*, a treaty whereby the military force of the duchies should belong to the Prussian army, and the cession of the port of Kiel and several forts and military roads in such fashion as to honeycomb the territory with Prussian forces (February, 1865). The

Duke hesitated, and laid down as a condition that the treaty should be agreed to by the representatives of the people. Now, the people of the duchies, by various manifestations, had shown an aversion to the Prussian government.

Bismarck then proposed annexation to Prussia. Austria rejected this. In the duchies the Prussian commissioner, by his manner of treating the local authorities, had put himself in conflict with his Austrian colleague. People began to talk of a war between Austria and Prussia. Bismarck wished it, knowing that Austria was not ready. One battle, he said to the Bavarian minister, would suffice to enable Prussia to dictate her terms. But King William preferred peace. By the Convention of Gastein (August, 1865) the two powers shared the *possession* of the duchies, Austria taking Holstein and Prussia Schleswig.

An assembly of delegates of the state legislatures of Germany, convoked at Frankfort in October, declared the Convention of Gastein a "violation of right." In the name of the right of the people of Schleswig-Holstein to decide their own fate, the assembly invited the people of the duchies to persist and the whole people of Germany to sustain them. Prussia and Austria replied by sending threatening despatches to the Diet of Frankfort, informing it that they could no longer endure those "subversive manœuvres," and that they regarded the committee of thirty-six as a permanent organ for the revolutionary party of Germany. In the Diet, the governments of the other states, intimidated, did not venture to come to any decision. In Schleswig the Prussian government systematically persecuted the advocates of independence, threatened to arrest the Duke if he entered the duchy, confiscated newspapers that gave him the title of Duke of Schleswig, took revenge on a town that had received the Duke by placing a Prussian garrison in it, suppressed all patriotic societies, dismissed public officers favouring independence, and even replaced them with Danish sympathizers. Prussia had on her side in the duchies only Danes and a few nobles; her policy in Schleswig brought her into collision with the patriots of the duchies and with all the liberals in Germany. But their protestations were lost on the Prussian army, which formed the reliance of the Prussian government.

Dissolution of the Confederation (1866).—In making the war of 1864 in their own way, displacing the agents of the Diet, Austria and Prussia had morally destroyed the confederation made by them in 1815 with the other German states. When, later,

they broke with each other, they destroyed it effectually; and there was nothing left for them to do, after the war, but to recognise officially the destruction they had wrought.

The rupture between Austria and Prussia, delayed by the Convention of Gastein, came about on account of the duchies. The Austrian governor of Holstein, following a policy opposed to that of the Prussians in Schleswig, encouraged the partisans of independence and Duke Frederick. He allowed them to hold an assembly which demanded the convocation of the regular representatives of the duchies (January, 1866). Bismarck charged the Austrian government with aiding a revolutionary movement, and summoned it to say plainly whether it wished to act in harmony with Prussia. The Emperor answered that he had done nothing of which Prussia had a right to complain, but that he could not, to please her, make any further sacrifice of his good relations with the other German states.

Prussia at once began preparations for war by negotiating with Italy. She sent to the Diet a plan of radical reform of the confederation, including a parliament elected by universal suffrage (April, 1866). Austria made friendly understandings with the other states, taking advantage of the indignation felt by the liberals and patriots against Prussia; most of the legislatures were in her favour and voted additional military supplies. Both sides were arming. Austria convoked the "estates" of Holstein.

The offensive was taken by Prussia. She marched her troops into Holstein, and the Austrian troops withdrew. Austria asked the Diet to intervene and call out the federal troops. The public rupture was made by the vote on this question (June 14). There were nine votes in favour and six against—Prussia not voting. As to two of the votes included in the majority there was some doubt, as they were cast in the name of groups of small states some of which had not clearly expressed their judgment, Prussia declared at once that she regarded the federal compact as broken—announcing, however, at the same time that she "held to the unity of the German nation" and would endeavour to re-establish it on a more solid basis. She published her scheme of a federal constitution with an elected parliament.

The states that had refused to vote (Oldenburg, Mecklenburg, and Luxemburg) remained neutral. Those which had voted with Austria made an alliance with her against Prussia. The war was between Prussia single-handed, on the one side, and

Austria and the chief German states on the other. The four kingdoms, Bavaria, Wurtemberg, Saxony, and Hanover, the two Hesses, Nassau, and Baden all took up arms against Prussia. But, in addition to the alliance with Italy,—which gave occupation to a part of the Austrian forces,—Prussia had the advantage of an army better prepared and a more rapid mobilization. She made war simultaneously in three separate quarters of Germany, and in all three she took the offensive.

1. In Northern Germany, she invaded Hanover, Hesse-Cassel, and Nassau, after an ultimatum which offered them neutrality on condition of disarming and accepting the Prussian plan of union. She occupied the whole territory of Hanover, surprised its army on the march to join Saxony, and, in spite of initial defeat, compelled it to surrender at Langensalza, June 25.

2. In the southeast she occupied Saxony without a battle. Then, with three armies, she invaded Bohemia, where the struggle with Austria was decided in a single battle at Sadowa, July 4.

3. In the southwest the Bavarian army and the armies of the other South German states lost time in confused operations and had not even succeeded in joining forces before the battle of Sadowa. A Prussian army, attacking them separately, defeated them and occupied Frankfort. This free city was severely treated: the Prussian general arrested several of its senators, suppressed its newspapers, and imposed a war contribution of six million thalers. His successor demanded twenty-five millions under threat of burning the city. The burgomaster, in despair, hanged himself. The southern states, abandoned by Austria, sued for peace.

The immediate result of the war was the formal dissolution of the Confederation. Austria accepted this result and gave her consent to a new organization of Germany, in which she should have no part. Prussia, thus made sole mistress of Germany, established a new union in accordance with her own plan, compelling all the states north of the river Main to join it. Only four German states remained outside of it—Bavaria, Wurtemberg, Baden, and Hesse-Darmstadt. The “line of the Main” was adopted on the demand of foreign powers, especially of France, which hoped to limit the extent of the new union, and to play off a southern confederation against the northern one. But the southern states had already concluded treaties of alliance, offensive and defensive, with Prussia; the South German confederation was never formed.

The Prussian victory ended the rivalry between the two great powers, which had maintained the system of petty states and the dualism of Germany; but it has done so at the cost of expelling eight millions of Germans, subjects of Austria. It was the final abandonment of the Greater-Germany idea—the triumph of the Prussian scheme of a Lesser-Germany.

Annexations by Prussia.—Prussia immediately took advantage of her commanding position to round out her territory. The duchies of Schleswig and Holstein she annexed outright without consulting the inhabitants, even of the north, although a clause of the treaty of Prague provided “that the people of the northern districts of Schleswig shall be ceded to Denmark, if by a free vote they manifest a desire for union with that country.” Bismarck relied only on the right of conquest. Austria had ceded her rights in the larger duchies to Prussia by the treaty of Prague. Her share in the duchy of Lauenburg she had sold to Prussia before the war.

Prussia also annexed the three states lying between her western provinces and the rest of the Kingdom: Hanover, Hesse-Cassel and Nassau; also the city of Frankfort. The King’s message announcing these annexations justified them by the judgment of God and the duties of Prussia. “The governments of those states . . . by rejecting the neutrality offered by Prussia . . . appealed to the arbitrament of war. The issue, by the decree of God, has gone against them. Political necessity compels us not to restore to them the authority of which they have been deprived by the victories of our armies. These countries, if they kept their independence, could, by reason of their geographical position, create embarrassments for Prussia far beyond the measure of their natural power.” The bill providing for their annexation declared that Prussia ought not to be obliged, in case of war, to “employ an important part of her forces in occupying countries that menaced her in the rear.” It added that the governments of the annexed states, “by their obstinate refusal of reform in the Confederation,” had made their retention impossible by showing that it was not to be reconciled with an organization satisfactory to the German nation.

The committee of the Lower House sought another title than that of conquest: it held that “mere force alone now no longer suffices as a basis of national ownership; no professor of international law recognises it as giving title.” Bismarck replied: “Our right is the right of the German nation to exist, to breathe,

to unite; it is the right and duty of Prussia to give Germany the condition of things necessary for her existence."

In contrast with Italy and France, which had a popular vote taken before every annexation, Prussia consulted none of the annexed communities. The royal message admitted that "only a part of the inhabitants agreed in the necessity" of annexation, but it expressed the "confidence that a living participation in the continued development of the common nationality . . . would make easy for them the transition into a new and larger community." The people of Hesse-Cassel and Nassau accepted without resistance the Prussian connection. Those of the northern duchies, except the Danes of Schleswig, resigned themselves to it, joining at the same time the Liberal opposition. In Hanover a large body of dissatisfied people hoped for some years for a return of the old dynasty, and formed a "Guelph" party strong enough to carry some parliamentary seats. At Frankfort many young men got themselves naturalized as citizens of Switzerland; but the Prussian government announced that it should treat as Prussians all who remained in the country.

By the annexations Prussia raised her population to 25,000,000 and gave her territory a cohesion which it had always lacked. But by her appeal to the old right of conquest, by her decision not to recognise the right of the people affected to vote on the question of annexation, by the language of Bismarck, so different from the delicate formalities of diplomacy, by the repressive actions of the Prussian generals in Schleswig and at Frankfort, she gave Europe the impression of a barbarous power greedy for conquests, and aroused apprehensions which twenty-five years of a peaceable policy have hardly sufficed to dissipate.

Formation of the North German Confederation (1866-67).—The union of Northern Germany spoken of in the treaty of Prague was formed by agreement between the governments of the states and the King of Prussia in 1866. Then the draft of a constitution, based on these agreements, was discussed and accepted by an assembly elected by universal suffrage (1867).

The North German Confederation (*Norddeutsche Bund*) included all Germany except the four states of the south; even Hesse-Darmstadt entered it for her fragment of territory north of the Main. Although it still bore the old name of *Bund*, it differed profoundly from the *Bund* of 1815. According to the expression of theoretic writers, it was not a "federation of states" (*Staatenbund*), but a federal state (*Bundesstaat*). Each of the

states preserved its own government, but they all became subject to a superior government, armed with physical power.

This federal government was organized according to the plan which had been officially proposed by Bismarck in 1865 and 1866, and which revived the program of the *Union* of 1849. It was composed of a Presidency permanently assigned to the King of Prussia, a Federal Council (*Bundesrath*) representing the various governments, and an elected assembly (*Reichstag*) representing the people. A place was thus formed for each of the three forces which contended for the control of Germany,—the King of Prussia, the sovereign princes, and the elective parliament,—but their powers were not equal. The Prussian government, victorious over the other governments and the parliamentary opposition, took for itself the controlling position in the new Germany.

The King of Prussia exercised his Presidency through a chancellor chosen at his pleasure. He held all the powers, military as well as diplomatic, the right to make war and to conclude treaties, the right to appoint and receive ambassadors, the position of commander-in-chief of the federal army, with the right of appointing all the corps commanders and heads of garrisons, the right to determine the organization of the federal army, to decree regulations and to supervise the execution of them. He was also the political sovereign for home affairs; head of the federal government, whose officers he appointed, with the power of keeping the other members of the union to their duty by the use of military force.

The Federal Council consisted of delegates from the several states, government officers, bound by their instructions as in the old Diet. It had permanent committees to act for it when not in session. The votes in the Council were distributed among the princes as in the former Diet; there were forty-three in all, of which Prussia held seventeen, and Saxony, the next highest, four.* For any change of the constitution a majority of two-thirds was required.

The *Reichstag* consisted of two hundred and ninety-seven members elected by universal suffrage, in the proportion of one for every 100,000 inhabitants. It had only the power of voting

* Prussia's seventeen were assigned on the basis of adding to her own original four votes, the votes of the states she had annexed—Hanover four, Holstein three, Hesse-Cassel three, Nassau two, Frankfort one.

on proposed changes of law and on the budget. The members received no pay.

This organization thus consisted in a combination of the old Diet with the Prussian Constitution, but construed, in Bismarck's fashion, as giving supreme power to the King. The King of Prussia, as President, had not only the military force, but also the control of the other powers; he convoked and dissolved the *Reichstag*; his chancellor presided over the *Bundesrath*.

Everything suggestive of parliamentary control had been avoided. Bismarck had refused to institute a responsible federal ministry; the chancellor alone represented the federal government before the *Reichstag*, the other ministers of the Confederation were only his clerks; the decrees of the King-President were countersigned by him alone. He "took the responsibility," said the constitution, but this was only a *moral* responsibility. The *Reichstag* had no hold on the Chancellor and consequently none on the government; it had only the negative power of refusing to pass new laws.

The two assemblies were of so different origin that the government ran little risk of finding them united against it. On the contrary, Bismarck counted on playing them off against each other: of using the *Bundesrath*, naturally aristocratic and monarchical, to check the democratic and parliamentary claims of the elected body, and of using the *Reichstag*, the organ of national public opinion, to overcome the particularist tendencies of the state governments. He insisted on an assembly chosen by universal suffrage as a bulwark against state feeling. (This was the time of enormous majorities for the Imperial government in France, under universal suffrage.)

While forming a confederation, the German states preserved their separate existence and organization. The powers were shared between the new federal government and the old local governments. The principle laid down by Bismarck was "to find the minimum of concession which the several states must make to the whole, in order that it may live" and "to demand of the state governments only those sacrifices which are indispensable for the success of a national community."

All the powers necessary for establishing national and economic unity were assigned to the federal government. (1) The military forces—army and navy; (2) International relations, ambassadors, consuls, treaties; (3) Commerce and transportation, customs duties, mail and telegraph, money, weights and meas-

ures, general regulation of railroads, banking, passports, oversight of aliens; (4) sanitary organization; (5) a part of the legislative power over commercial law, maritime law, criminal law, and judicial procedure.

The armies of all the states were organized on the Prussian model: universal military service for three years in the active army and four years in the reserve. The Prussian system of local regiments and divisions made it possible to leave each contingent in its own state (the Saxon troops even formed a separate army corps), but the whole force was equipped and drilled on the Prussian system, under the supervision of Prussian officers. The new national flag—black, white, and red—was the symbol of Prussian hegemony, her colors being black and white.

For the federal expenses a federal budget was created. The revenues were of two sorts: (1) The revenues from customs, from indirect taxes on consumption, and from the post office and telegraphs; (2) The contributions paid by the several states according to fixed proportions (*Matrikel*), to make up any deficiency. The government demanded that the Reichstag renounce the right of annual vote in the case of the army expenses; the appropriation was made for a five-year period, at the rate of 225 thalers for each soldier.

The several states retained all the other powers: justice, civil rights, public worship, education, public works, together with their independent administrative and financial systems, their local legislatures, and their legislative power. They were no longer sovereign, but they remained *autonomous*, much more independent than the Swiss cantons.

The whole arrangement was a compromise between national unity and traditional state independence, or rather between the King of Prussia and the other princes. "We recalled," said Bismarck, "the forces of resistance which wrecked the attempts at Frankfort and Erfurt, and tried to arouse them as little as possible." He had been urgent for the speedy realization of a national system: "Let us work quickly, gentlemen; let us place Germany in the saddle; she will know how to ride."

Transformation of the Parties (1866-70).—Between the two great wars of 1866 and 1870 Germany went through a profound transformation. The Confederation became a nation, and the struggle for and against national unity, which dominated public life, produced a new formation of parties and a change of policy on the part of the Prussian government. The victory of 1866

ended the constitutional contest in Prussia. The Progress party, which had conducted the struggle, was abandoned by the voters. In the House of Representatives elected in June, 1866, it had barely seventy members, nearly all from the west or from the province of Prussia; the Conservatives rose in number to nearly a hundred. The question of theory had not been settled, and even the ministry recognised the right of the House to vote the budget, for it asked for the passage of an act of indemnity relieving it of the responsibility it had incurred in governing without a regular budget. But this act of indemnity, passed by 230 votes against 75, was a practical victory for the government. The ministry remained in office, and the King declared that he would do the same thing again in a similar case. A new party was formed under the name of "National Liberal," which declared its intention "to sustain the government fully in its foreign policy" while "maintaining in home matters the position of a watchful and loyal opposition."

Presently a provisional *Reichstag* was elected by the people of all the states, to discuss the constitution (February, 1867). The majority of the body consisted of Liberals who had come over to Bismarck. Furthermore it could do little but ratify the scheme previously drawn up by the governments; it made only some amendments of detail. On the points of disagreement between the majority and Bismarck, it was the majority that yielded; in spite of formal votes in favour of a responsible federal ministry and payment of the members of the *Reichstag*, neither proposal was adopted in the constitution.

At the regular elections to the *Reichstag* and the Prussian House of Representatives, in August, 1867, the parties succeeded in clearing up their issues.

The *National Liberal* party drew to itself a part of the Progressists, some remnants of the "Old Liberals," and some deputies of the liberal opposition in the annexed provinces, Hanover, Hesse, and Nassau. Coalescing with the Liberal Conservatives detached from the old Conservative party, it formed the government majority. It wished for a consolidation of Prussia by the assimilation of the annexed provinces, and for a completion of the German union by the admission of the southern states into the Confederation. It accepted, therefore, the leadership of Bismarck, and confined itself to asking him for certain liberal reforms: the reform of the local institutions by the abolition of the remaining powers of the nobles; the reform of the primary

schools by withdrawing them from the power of the clergy; the reform of the Prussian electoral system by the introduction of simple universal suffrage. It wished also for some economic reforms, especially freedom of industry and commerce. It was a party of middle-class imperialists, opposed to the influences which had till then dominated Prussian life—the nobles, the clergy, and the official class. Its chief strength lay in the centre of the old kingdom and in the annexed provinces. Its leader, Bennigsen, was the leader of the former Liberal opposition in Hanover. The manufacturers, the merchants, and the university professors belonged to it; it included many Jews.

The Free Conservatives, of whom there were forty in the Reichstag of 1867, were large land-proprietors of the central provinces, and Silesia, stalwart ministerialists, ready to vote for all measures proposed by the government.

The bulk of the Conservative party, calling themselves German Conservatives in the *Reichstag*, were the old aristocratic party of the *Kreuzzeitung*, which had supported Bismarck and the King in the constitutional conflict. Its strength lay chiefly among the great landowners of the eastern provinces. It sought to maintain the power of the nobles and clergy. Its stronghold was in the Prussian Parliament, where it constituted almost the whole House of Lords and had a strong minority in the Lower House. Its opponents accused it of devotion to exclusively Prussian interests.

The Progress party, greatly weakened by the triumph of its adversary Bismarck, dwindled to twenty members in the *Reichstag*; only the large cities and a part of Schleswig-Holstein remained faithful to it. It continued the liberal opposition, while accepting the policy of union.

From this time new parties of radical opposition appeared. In the new provinces these were parties of protest against the annexation. In Schleswig the Danes demanded the popular vote promised in the treaty of Prague; there were two of them in the provisional *Reichstag*; the government, by a new districting, reduced them to one in the regular *Reichstag* and two in the Prussian Parliament.

In Hanover the Guelph party, seven in the *Reichstag* and three in the Prussian Parliament, was a coalition between the partisans of the expelled King and patriots who disliked the Prussian system. In the old Prussian province of Posen, which belonged to the Prussian Kingdom but had remained outside of the German

Confederation, the Polish deputies protested against the incorporation of the Grand Duchy of Posen into the North German Confederation, as contrary to the treaties; also "against every act designed to give the Poles of Prussia a German character and destroy their national existence." The Polish party, counting 13 in the *Reichstag*, a score in the Prussian Parliament, was made up of Catholic nobles.

By the side of these parties of protest on nationalist grounds a party of protest on social grounds appeared—the Socialists. As early as 1848, Socialists of the French type were found in Germany. But the party, dispersed by persecutions, did not reappear until 1863, when it got a footing among the labourers of the eastern provinces of Prussia. It was formed by the activity of a Jewish orator, Lassalle, a Socialist of 1848, who held doctrines borrowed from the old French Socialists, together with Louis Blanc's "national workshops," managed by labourers, at the cost of the state. He revived the old French name of "Social-Democrat," making it the title of his journal, founded in 1865. It was a time of struggle. Lassalle, opposing the middle-class Progressists, had relations with Bismarck, who was later reproached with having encouraged the Socialists. The party at first got its recruits among the co-operative societies founded by Schulze-Delitsch, a liberal. With the introduction of universal suffrage, it entered the political field. Lassalle, who was killed in a duel in 1864, left the party organized under a monarchical dictatorship. His second successor, Schweitzer, was elected to the *Reichstag* of 1867.

In opposition to this Prussian Socialist party of Lassalle's disciples, there was formed an International party under Marx. This had its strongholds at first outside of Prussia—in Saxony, among the "educational societies for workingmen" (*Arbeiterbildungsvereine*) organized by the middle-class Progressists. Their founder was Liebknecht, a revolutionary journalist of 1848, who had fled to London, where he became a disciple of Marx. He converted the favourite orator of the Saxon labourers, Bebel, a lathe-worker and Catholic democrat, who, in 1867-68, went over to socialism with his associates. The meeting of "educational societies" at Nuremberg in 1868 declared in favour of the International by a two-thirds vote. Later the "Social Democratic Workingman's party" was founded (1869). Its program, drawn up at Eisenach, combined the demands of the Swiss radical party with the economic doctrines of Marx.* Its two

leaders, Liebknecht and Bebel, sat in the Reichstag as early as 1867.

The two socialist parties, after abortive negotiations in 1868-69, remained in a position of rivalry till 1874.

In presence of the new condition of parties, Bismarck modified his policy. He ceased to lean exclusively on the Conservatives and gradually made approaches to the National Liberals. In Prussia he retained the ministry of the conflict time, although the Liberal majority of the Prussian Lower House protested against the minister of education, Mühler, who advocated clerical control of the schools. Not till December, 1869, did he admit two National Liberals as colleagues. But as early as 1868 the Conservatives of the Prussian Lower House, having refused him the creation of a provincial debt for Hanover (even after a threat of resignation, he carried it only by a majority of 198 against 192), he began to make terms with the National Liberals by accepting their administrative and economic reforms. The reform of the local institutions dragged till 1872; but the economic reforms proceeded rapidly (1868-69), especially those in the federal domain: repeal of usury laws, abolition of restrictions on business enterprises (1867), freedom of marriage (1868), freedom of industry, abolition of imprisonment for debt, removal of restrictions on labour unions. Later the Supreme Tribunal of Commerce was organized and the new penal code adopted.

In those practical reforms Bismarck was in agreement with the National Liberals. But he continued to reject with disdain and mockery their demands for a responsible ministry and payment of Representatives.

These measures of reorganization seem to have made many opponents, especially among the peoples who, up to that time, had been outside the Prussian system. The Prussian universal military service, introduced at a stroke, seemed too severe. It brought new expenses and caused deficits in all the states, even in Prussia itself, and compelled an increase of the taxes. The new system of economic freedom disturbed the old ways of the great landowners and artisans.

Of the annexed countries it was Hanover which gave most emphatic signs of hostility. The King of Hanover rejected the money indemnity offered to him by the Prussian government (the other dispossessed sovereigns accepted it). He demanded the restoration of his kingdom, negotiated with the enemies of

* For the programs of the various Socialist parties, see chap. xxiv.

Prussia, and formed in France the Guelph Legion, consisting of Hanoverian volunteers. Bismarck took advantage of this to sequester the Hanoverian indemnity (the Guelph Fund) and to get authority to use the interest. He used it at first in paying a secret police to watch the Guelph agents—the thing he called “following the reptiles into their holes in order to find out what they are doing” (1868). But little by little the “reptile fund,” as it was then called, came to be used in bribing German newspapers, and the name “reptile press” was applied to the ministerial journals.

Southern Germany.—In southern Germany the four independent states continued to be torn by two contradictory policies. Already united to Prussia by the *Zollverein* and the treaties of alliance of 1866, they could not keep themselves entirely independent of the Northern Confederation. The Grand Duke and legislature of Baden would have been willing to join it; they held aloof from fear of European complications. But in the two kingdoms, Bavaria and Wurtemberg, there was no desire for a closer union with the North; the governments from attachment to their independent sovereignty, the people from aversion to the Prussians and their military service, preferred to stand aloof. The governments would not even have the Southern Confederation dreamed of by Napoleon III., for fear of being drawn into union with northern Germany.

The southern states, therefore, remained isolated. Bismarck tried to attract them by means of the *Zollverein*. He arranged that the customs tariff, instead of being established by treaties between the governments, should be voted in the form of a law by a *Customs' Parliament*, consisting of the North German Reichstag with the addition of deputies elected by universal suffrage in the southern states (1868). But the enemies of Prussia had the upper hand in the south, the democratic party in Wurtemberg and the Catholic party in Bavaria; the National Liberals had a majority in Baden only. Of 85 members elected to the Customs Parliament only 24 were in favour of union with the north; 46 were hostile to Prussia; the rest followed their governments. In combination with the Conservatives and professed opponents of Bismarck in the north, they formed a majority against union. The Customs' Parliament rejected an address in favour of union, by 186 to 150, and then refused to impose a tax on petroleum (1868). It lasted till 1870, but confined its action to matters connected with the customs duties.

In southern Germany the opposition to Prussia increased. In Wurtemberg the democratic majority proposed the Swiss military system (1868), and later a reduction of the military expenses; the ministry resigned. In Bavaria a dissolution of the legislature resulted in a re-election of the Catholic (Patriot) majority, which forced the King to dismiss his ministry and demanded a reduction of the military service to eight months. Even in Baden the National party was weakening in its resistance to the ministers.

Foundation of the Empire (1870-71).—At the beginning of 1870 German unity seemed farther off than in 1866. The war with France brought a great change. All the states of Germany went heartily with the Confederation. Then the great victories won in common created a strong feeling of German unity.

Before the end of the war, during the siege of Paris, the princes of the southern states offered to join the Confederation, and on the suggestion of the King of Bavaria it was decided to revive the old historical names of *Reich* and *Kaiser*—Empire and Emperor. This was only an extension of territory and a change of name. There was no new constitution. By separate treaties between the Confederation and the four southern states, these were admitted to the existing union, under its new name of German Empire; the two larger states obtained some special conditions—even in military matters. Bavaria retained her independent postal system and her own military uniform.

The Empire was inaugurated by a ceremony in which the princes alone took part. The King of Prussia was crowned Emperor at Versailles in presence of the German sovereigns in January, 1871. At that time the treaties between the governments had been presented to the parliaments of the four southern states affected. In Bavaria the Patriot anti-Prussian majority divided: one part joined the national liberal minority, thus forming a two-thirds majority, 102 to 48; the other part, consisting of the deputies of the most intensely Catholic rural districts, entered a protest in the name of Bavarian independence, January, 1871. The other three southern states had ratified the conventions in 1870 with almost no opposition. In ratifying the treaties between the governments, the Reichstag, in April, 1871, transformed them officially into the Constitution of the Empire.

The territory taken from France was annexed, not to Prussia, as the National Liberals demanded, but to the Empire. It became the "Imperial Province" (*Reichsland*) Alsace-Lorraine, and

was placed in an exceptional relation with the government. Having become a member of the Confederation, not by agreement but by conquest, it received no autonomous government and no delegates to the Federal Council; it was put directly under the power of the Imperial government; that is, it was actually governed by the Chancellor, with the assistance of a special bureau. As in 1866, the country was annexed without consulting the inhabitants.

The Empire thus constituted was unlike any preceding form of government. Theorists in public law found it difficult to define. It was a federated state formed of small autonomous monarchies, but subject to a higher sovereign, a federation (*Bund*) that had become an Empire (*Reich*) without ceasing to be a federation. The official document reads: "This *Bund* shall bear the name of *Reich*." The federation had no federal government outside of and superior to all the federated governments. One of its members, the King of Prussia, supported by irresistible military power and invested with the higher dignity of Emperor, commanded all the others as a superior; the princes were no longer his equals, but his subjects.

The individual states became subordinate to the Empire, not only in affairs common to all, such as foreign, military, and commercial affairs, but submitted in their own local concerns to the laws that should be adopted by the Imperial government. They were bound by perpetual treaties, but with no guarantees for the future. No limit was set to the power of the federal government to amend the constitution; it could change the organization by laws of such a kind as to restrict indefinitely the autonomous rights of the states; it could even transform the Empire and deprive it of its federal character, on the sole condition of getting two-thirds majority in the Federal Council. Even the special rights reserved to some of the states by treaty can be relinquished by the government of the state without the consent of the legislature.

The federal government itself has been so constructed as to give the Emperor the same preponderating power in the Empire as he had in Prussia as King. No decision can be made in opposition to him. He governs by his own sovereign power, as in a constitutional monarchy, through his chancellor, who depends on him alone, and is beyond the reach of the elected assembly of the nation. The sovereignty belongs, not to the German people, but to the Emperor and the Federal Council.

The "fundamental rights" of the individual, expressly guaranteed in 1848, were not mentioned in 1871. The "Constitution of the German Empire" is only a practical regulation of powers; like Bismarck, the founder of the Empire, it is matter-of-fact.

The empire is not even established precisely on the lines of nationality. It is the territory of the Kingdom of Prussia, enlarged by states that entered the *Zollverein* and by districts conquered by Prussia. It does not even include the whole German nation: the Austrian Germans are outside of it. It does include the alien populations annexed by conquest and still protesting against the connection: the Poles of Posen and Prussia, the Danes of Schleswig, and the French of Alsace-Lorraine.

BIBLIOGRAPHY.*

BIBLIOGRAPHY.—See **Waitz**, "Quellenkunde," 1894 edit.

DOCUMENTS.—The principal collections are: Reports of the Chambers; "Die Innere Politik der Preussischen Regierung," 1866, collection of government acts during the constitutional conflict.—**L. Hahn**, "Fürst Bismarck," 5 vols., 1878-91; collection of all Bismarck's speeches and declarations.—**H. Kohl**, "Die Politischen Reden des Fürsten Bismarck," 9 vols., 1892-94. There is a French edition of Bismarck's speeches.

For practical use all important documents and a detailed story of events may be found in **Schulthess**, "Europ. Geschichtskalender," 1 vol. a year since 1860.—The principal political reviews for this period are the "Grenzboten" and the "Preussische Jahrbücher."

WORKS.—Of the endless German books it is difficult to make a selection. An outline will be found in **von Sybel**, "Die Begründung des Deutschen Reiches," 4th edit., 7 vols., 1893-94, imperialist, semi-official, not enough references.—**Oncken**, "Zeitalter Wilhelms I.," vol. i., 1890 (Oncken coll.), a scientific popular work.

In French: **E. Simon**, "L'Empereur Guillaume," 1886; "Hist. du Prince de Bismarck."

FOR INSTITUTIONS: **Roenne**, (see chap. xiv.) and **Laband**, "Das Staatsrecht des Deutschen Reiches," 3 vols., 1876-82.—**Mohl**, "Das Deutsche Reichsstaatsrecht."

* On the character of this bibliog. see chap. xii.

CHAPTER XVI.

THE GERMAN EMPIRE.

Parties in the Empire.—The union of all the states into one Empire completed the political transformation begun in 1866. The Reichstag, established above the legislatures of the individual states, attracted the greater part of political activity, and the parties were formed on questions of national policy.

The grouping continued to be nearly the same as in the North German Confederation, but the proportions were different. As was the case before 1870, the Reichstag continued to be divided into ten or more parties of which no one has ever had a majority by itself. It is difficult to classify them according to their attitude toward the government, for several of them have changed their attitude according to the government's policy. Nevertheless, a distinction may be made between the parties of systematic opposition, hostile to the very constitution of the Empire, and the parties of intermittent opposition under the constitution.

The systematic opposition consisted of groups of very different character. There were three parties of national protest, formed by the deputies of the non-German peoples at the three extremities of the Empire: the Schleswig Danes, one deputy; the Poles of Posen and Prussia, varying in number from 13 to 19, according to the result of the elections in the districts of mixed nationality, an aristocratic and Catholic party won over since 1890; the Alsace-Lorrainers, since 1874, represented by 15 deputies, a democratic party, for the greater part Catholic. All three protested against the incorporation of their country in the Empire. There was a party of dynastic protest, the Guelphs of Hanover, hostile to Prussia; the permanent nucleus of the party was composed of the partisans of the nobles and of the Lutheran clergy, who remained faithful to the legitimate King. Around these have gathered voters dissatisfied with the Prussian government, so that the membership of the party has increased from four to eleven deputies.

The party of social protest, at first divided into two wings, was

united after the elections of 1874 into one party, the Socialist Workingman's party, organized at Gotha in 1875. It was a radical party systematically opposed to monarchical government, to the social system, to the influence of the clergy; and although it was not allowed to take the name of republican, it openly declared itself hostile to the whole monarchical system. At first the elections and the Reichstag were for the Socialists merely a means for spreading their doctrines; they put forward candidates, even in places where they knew they had no chance of electing them, in order to gather partisans on all sides. They cared more for the whole number of votes given to these candidates throughout the Empire than for the number of deputies they elected. In the Reichstag the party abstained from taking part in ordinary business, but were always on the watch for opportunities to attack existing institutions and always voted against the government. Only after 1890 it began to take a positive part in the labours of the Reichstag. Since the fusion of 1875 it has retained its former leaders of the Marx section, Liebknecht and Bebel. It has its strongholds in the large cities and the manufacturing districts, in the Prussian provinces of the Rhine, of Saxony, and of Silesia, in Berlin and Hamburg, and in the Kingdom of Saxony. The number of voters belonging to it has risen in almost constant progression from 300,000 to 1,700,000; the number of deputies has varied between 2 and 44. (At the elections of 1898 the number of voters was 2,120,000 out of a total of 7,600,000, and the number of socialist deputies elected was 56.)

The remaining parties have accepted the Empire and its constitution; they are classified according to the direction which they try to give to the government. The chief questions on which they are divided relate to the matters directly submitted to the Reichstag; the federal budget, the army, the customs and indirect taxes, the relations between ministers and Reichstag, questions of law and of legal procedure. But they do not limit themselves strictly to these matters. They form combinations with the parties in the Prussian Parliament that have formed around questions of the Church and the schools. Almost all of them originated and have their chief power in Prussia.

The Conservative party (*Deutschconservativ*) was a continuation of the old aristocratic and orthodox Protestant party of Prussia. Like the original it had its strength in the farming regions of eastern Prussia, was made up of great landowning nobles, and

had the same organ, the *Kreuzzeitung*. Its aims were to preserve the established institutions—the power of the King, the organization of the army, the authority of the aristocracy over the peasants, and of the clergy over the schools. Without openly combatting the new constitution of the Empire, it protested against the tendency of the Liberals to “absorb Prussia into Germany”; it sought to prevent the assimilation in order to maintain the special system of aristocratic old eastern Prussia. It was regarded as a Prussian particularist party, hostile to the national unity, and it had, in fact, few supporters outside of Prussia. By sustaining the King and his ministry in the conflict period it had acquired a strong influence over King William; it remained the party of the court and the nobility. It was undisputed master of the Prussian House of Lords. In the Reichstag it had a very variable number of deputies,—from 21 to 76,—according as it supported or opposed the ministry.

The Conservative-Liberal or Imperial party (*Reichspartei*), made up of large manufacturers, great landowners (especially in Silesia), and office-holders, always supported the ministry and became liberal when Bismarck adopted a liberal policy (see p. 494).

The National-Liberal party, drawing support from all parts of the Empire, remained what it had been from its birth, a middle-class imperialist anti-clerical party. Its program was to support Bismarck in giving the Empire a strong organization and to obtain from him in return a constitutional system with free trade and anti-clerical tendencies. It demanded a responsible ministry for the Empire, payment of the people’s representatives, complete freedom of industry and commerce, including free trade and a reduction of the excise taxes on consumption. In Prussia it demanded freedom of the press, a reform of local administration that should abolish the authority of the nobles over the peasantry, and a reform of the school system that should take away the clerical control of education.

The party of Progress (*Fortschritt*; since 1884 *Freisinnig*) has always preserved its original program. It was, like the National-Liberals, a middle-class party of anti-clerical tendencies, but it was an opposition party, hostile to the military system and to the bureaucratic method of administration. It demanded a reduction of the period of service and of the expenses of the army, and it leaned toward a parliamentary government. It professed the doctrine of the English Manchester school as to the advan-

tages of free trade. When the National Liberal party abandoned this doctrine to follow Bismarck's evolution, a "secession" of free-traders left it (1881) and eventually joined the *Freisinnige*. This party drew its strength chiefly from the large cities, from Holstein, Hesse, the province of Prussia, and the Kingdom of Saxony.

The Democratic party (*Volkspartei*), peculiar to South Germany and especially to Wurtemberg, was radical, anti-clerical, and anti-Prussian. Greatly weakened by the founding of the Empire, it seems to have gathered strength since 1890 by its opposition to the ecclesiastical policy of the government.

The Centre was the Catholic party, formed at first in Prussia. There had always been in the Prussian Parliament a small "Catholic group," but nearly blended with the Conservatives. After the Vatican Council and the capture of Rome by Italy, a completely separate party was organized in the parliament of 1870, formed exclusively of Catholics, of whom there were fifty-six. It presented itself as a conservative monarchical party with Catholic tendencies. Its first formal act was an address to the King asking him to help the Pope in recovering his temporal power (February, 1871). The party immediately began activity in the Reichstag of 1871, taking there also the name of Centre. Its published program demanded only the maintenance of the federal character of the Empire and the liberty of the Church. But it was then and has remained a purely Catholic party, found nowhere outside of the Catholic districts of Prussia, Bavaria, and Baden. It has had no other policy than to defend the Catholic religion and the Holy See, to maintain or increase the power of the clergy and to resist the secularizing parties. It is a conservative Catholic party; but, by a natural dislike of the Protestant government of the Empire, it has, on the federal side, assumed the character of an opposition. Recruited in part from the democratic population of the west, it has retained a popular following which has kept it in touch with the democratic parties.

Conditions of Political Life.—In order to understand the tactics of these German parties, it is necessary to bear in mind the constitutional arrangements of Germany.

The Empire, created in the likeness of Prussia, is a strictly *constitutional* monarchy, like France under Louis XVIII. The Emperor and his Chancellor in Germany, the King and his ministers in Prussia, exercise the sovereign powers of government through subordinates who depend on them alone. The repre-

sentatives of the people have no means of coercing the government, not even an independent power of legislation. The Reichstag has indeed the right of proposing changes of law; on the request of 15 members it can discuss and pass any bill: but no bill becomes a law without the consent of the Emperor and the princes of the Federal Council. Practically the power of the elected assembly is purely negative; it consists in the right of refusing to adopt new laws and new taxes desired by the government.

Practically the directing power lay with Bismarck, Chancellor of the Empire and President of the Prussian ministry,* the confidential adviser of the sovereign till 1890, a man who, in accordance with his doctrine of 1862, systematically prevented Germany from developing toward parliamentary government. Accustomed to be obeyed, he would endure no control on the part of the people's representatives, nor even a partial divergence of opinion on the part of his colleagues and his supporters in the legislative bodies. He even refused to permit the organization of a regular Imperial ministry; he reduced the federal government to a bureau of the Chancellor, composed of certain officials taking over work prepared for them by the Prussian ministry. Germany, like Prussia, has lived under a liberal bureaucratic system, under the personal government of the Emperor and his Chancellor. Political life has been dominated by Bismarck's views, then by those of William II., and by their attitude toward the political parties.

This government, master of the whole administration, needed to ask the Reichstag only for new taxes and occasionally for a piece of legislation, usually of the repressive sort. The parties, conscious of having no other means of action, adopted defensive tactics, opposing a passive resistance to the government, yielding to it one step at a time when they ran any risk of not being upheld in resistance by the voters, bargaining with it to induce it to abate its demands as much as possible, avoiding appropriations for long terms of years, and all legislation that would leave the Reichstag disarmed for the future, endeavouring to get concessions in return for their votes.

The government itself having, unlike parliamentary ministries, no need of a stable majority in order to govern, took advantage of the medley of parties to get a coalition, from time to

*The experiment of a President of the Prussian Ministry distinct from the Chancellor of the Empire (1873) was not lasting.

time, sufficient for the day of the vote. Among the parties accepting the constitution (Conservative, National-Liberal, Centre, Progress) it selected those it could win over to its policy most cheaply, and made such concessions to their several programs as were necessary in order to obtain their votes. Later, as its own policy changed, it turned to a new combination. As is natural in a monarchical country administered by powerful officials, each party, during its temporary alliance with the government, has been more numerous than when in opposition. This fluctuation has been most marked in the most ministerial parties: the Conservative, which has varied from 21 to 80; the Reichspartei from 57 to 21; the National-Liberal from 152 in 1874 to 50 in 1884, then from 99 in 1887 to 42 in 1890.

The following table shows approximately the strength of each party in the Reichstag since the founding of the Empire. The deputies not attached to any party, the so-called "Savages," are not included.

	1871	1874	1877	1878	1881	1884	1887	1890	1893	1898
Conservatives.	56	21	40	59	51	76	80	71	70	53
Reichspartei.....	39	36	38	57	27	28	41	21	27	21
National Liberals.....	120	152	127	98	43	50	99	42	52	48
Progress	46	49	36	25	61	65	32	67	23	43
People's Party	2	1	3	3	9	7	..	10	11	8
Socialists	2	9	12	9	12	9	11	24	44	56
Centre.....	63	91	92	94	97	100	98	107	99	103
Guelphs.....	4	4	5	10	10	11	4	11	7	9
Poles	14	14	14	14	18	16	13	16	19	14
Alsace-Lorrainers.....	..	15	10	15	15	13	15	10	8	10
Danes.....	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Anti-Semites	4	18	12

The German Empire must not be conceived as a centralized state in which the whole political life is centred in the Imperial government and the Reichstag. Neither in Prussia nor in the smaller states has the local legislature fallen to the level of a provincial council; it has continued to be a political assembly, discussing vital questions of education, the Church, taxation, etc.; and the division of parties in it has continued to be a living question.

Prussia's victories in war increased everywhere the party favouring German unity under Prussian leadership—the National-Liberal party. It has prevailed in Baden and Hesse over the

Catholic party. In Wurtemberg it allied itself with the ministers against the anti-military and anti-Prussian Democrats. In Bavaria it formed the nucleus of the Liberal party, which has its strength in the Rhenish Palatinate and among the Franconian Protestants, and which supports the ministers against the Catholic majority. Thanks to the Bavarian system, it nearly equals in the legislature the Patriot (Catholic) party, which has on its side the great majority of the voters. In Saxony it nearly equalled the old Conservative Lutheran party up to the time when the two joined hands against the Socialists, who were beginning to carry seats in the Legislature. In Mecklenburg, where as early as 1871 it had an enormous majority of the voters, it has been held in check by the deputies of the nobles (the *Ritterschaft*), who control the "Estates," which are still organized in the eighteenth century fashion. Several times the Reichstag has protested against these old "estates" as contrary to the constitution of the Empire; but the efforts for reform made by the Grand Duke have been nullified by the resistance of the nobles. Among the small states the voters are usually divided between the National-Liberals and the Progressives.

Like Prussia and the Empire, the German states are governed by sovereigns, ministers, and officials. The government is sometimes liberal, but never parliamentary. The legislature has only a negative power; it can worry the ministers, but cannot compel them to resign; in Bavaria the Lutz ministry has maintained itself continuously in office, in spite of the Catholic majority. All Germany still lives under bureaucratic monarchies.

The Culturkampf and the Organization of the Empire (1871-77).—During the first years of the new Empire, Bismarck, going on in his evolution of 1867, allied himself with the National-Liberal party in order to establish the institutions necessary to national unity. His chief opponents in those years were the Catholic Centre.

The Prussian Constitution of 1850, based on the model of the Belgian Constitution (see p. 235), had made the Catholic Church almost independent of the state: "The Evangelical and Catholic churches, as well as every other religious body, shall govern and manage their affairs in an independent manner." The government had thus abandoned its power of control over the clergy—"the right of proposing, nominating, electing, and confirming" bishops and priests, supervision of the publication of ecclesiastical acts, and of the external relations of the churches. It had at

the same time charged the clergy with the direction of the religious instruction in the primary schools. It had continued to the clergy their grants of public money, their power over civil status, their right to public honours, and the enforcement of ecclesiastical authority by the state. This meant freedom of the clergy from control of the civil government, while remaining a public power. The bishops, having become sole masters of their clergy, had acquired over the laity a political influence which showed itself sharply in the formation of the Centre party.

This unexpected revelation of the moral power of the clergy frightened and irritated the politicians. It became the fashion to denounce the Ultramontanes as "enemies of the Empire," and to compare them to the Guelphs and the Socialists. Then began the very complicated struggle between the Centre and the government which goes by the name of the *Culturkampf*, i. e., the fight for civilization. This was a long series of manifestoes by the Pope or the Catholic clergy of Germany, and of repressive measures by the government, the one in answer to the other, and growing in violence as the struggle progressed. The battle raged both in the Reichstag and in the Prussian Parliament.

The Centre began operations in the Prussian Parliament by demanding the restoration of the temporal power of the Pope (1871), and in the Reichstag by proposing to insert in the Imperial Constitution the articles of the Prussian Constitution which guarantee religious liberty. Bismarck took a special dislike to this party. It had for its leader Windthorst, a Hanoverian Guelph, who supported the Polish Catholics of Posen in their proposition to have Polish taught in the primary schools.

The set conflict began over the question of the "old Catholic" professors in the Catholic theological faculties of the Universities, and Catholic teachers in the public *Gymnasien* (Latin schools), who rejected the doctrine of the Pope's infallibility. The bishops forbade these men to go on with their teaching and then excommunicated them. The government, not itself approving the decrees of the Vatican Council, refused to dismiss the condemned teachers. The bishops protested in a collective address to the Emperor, September, 1871. The limits of the powers of the Church were thus made the subject of conflict.

The contest gradually widened. The priests, particularly in Bavaria, spoke from their pulpits against the Old Catholics and the government that protected them. On request of the Bavarian ministry, the Reichstag passed a clause supplementary to the

penal code of the Empire, punishing with imprisonment any priest indulging in political controversy or in attacks on the government from the pulpit (the "Pulpit Paragraph," December, 1871). In Prussia the Catholic clergy used their right of supervising the primary schools by dismissing the Old Catholic teachers, and their control over marriage licenses by refusing to marry Old Catholics. The government decided to curtail the powers of the clergy. It proposed a bill relating to marriages and one relating to the inspection of schools. The Conservative party and the Emperor himself, who insisted on the influence of the Protestant clergy over the schools and the religious character of marriage, were reluctant to accept proposals so contrary to the traditions established since 1840. At first the government succeeded only with the bill transferring the inspection of schools from the clergy to lay inspectors (February, 1872). The Minister of Public Worship, a partisan of the clergy, having lost Bismarck's confidence, was replaced by Falk, a partisan of the power of the state. The bishops protested, and the bishop of Posen refused to apply the inspection law.

Bismarck tried negotiations with the court of Rome, but was unable to induce the Pope to accept as ambassador Cardinal Hohenlohe. He complained in the Reichstag, where he pronounced the famous sentence, "We shall not go to Canossa" (May, 1872). The Pope replied in an allocution, denouncing the persecution of the Church in Germany. The answer of the government was an act expelling the Jesuits and affiliated orders from Germany. A new papal allocution against the "hypocritical persecution" was answered by the recall of the German ambassador to the Vatican (December, 1872). Diplomatic relations between the Pope and the German Empire were broken.

The clergy, forced to choose between their spiritual sovereign and the temporal power, unanimously went with the Pope. They protested against the commands and the laws of the civil power. The government, especially after the attempt of a Catholic labourer to assassinate Bismarck (July, 1874), treated the clergy as rebels. It prosecuted the bishops, seized their goods, deprived them of their jurisdiction, and finally put them in prison. At the same time, in order to bring the clergy under the power of the state, it secured the passage of the three series of acts known as the "May Laws," or "Falk Laws," 1873-75. The aim at first was to transform the bishops and priests into state officials, by requiring of every candidate for the priesthood

three years of study at the Universities and an examination in "general culture" (philosophy and history), also by requiring the bishops to give notice to the government of every ecclesiastical nomination, in order that the administrative officers might see to the enforcement of the new legislation. The state also assumed the right of supervision of all ecclesiastical seminaries. In order to deprive the clergy of their official authority the Emperor finally made up his mind, in 1874, to accept civil marriage for Prussia. In 1874 an imperial act established obligatory civil marriage for the whole Empire. The Pope, by an ecclesiastical letter to the Prussian bishops, solemnly declared these laws void, as contrary to the constitution of the Church, and pronounced his blessing on the condemned bishops. The conflict had become one of principle between the two powers.

The government demanded a declaration of submission to the new laws, and withheld the salaries of the bishops and priests who refused to make it. It induced the Prussian Parliament to repeal the articles of the Constitution of 1850 relating to the independence of the Church; also to pass, in 1875, a law dissolving all monasteries in the kingdom. Then Bismarck declared that the "armour was complete" and that the state would keep on the defensive. The contest, from that time on, consisted in manifestoes and protestations on the part of the clergy, and on the part of the government in prosecutions and punishments of those making them. Some of the bishoprics and parishes were left vacant; but the Catholic Centre, instead of submitting, increased its strength at the elections of 1874, and entered on a course of systematic opposition.

This contest caused Bismarck to depart from his old policy. In order to combat the Catholic Centre, he made approaches to the Liberal parties led by free-thinkers and Jews. The National Liberals, nicknamed "Bismarck's Party," had been elected to the number of 152, as friends of the government; they were able to make a majority of the Reichstag and of the Prussian Lower House, by combining with the Progress party. The Conservative ministers of the "conflict time" had been replaced, one after another, by National Liberals. The real power was exercised by a coalition of Bismarck and the Liberals.

Bismarck still held the reins. He yielded nothing to his new allies that could strengthen the Reichstag, and he rejected with disdain all their political demands: a responsible ministry and payment of the deputies (they had only free passes on the rail-

ways). He constrained them to support his army policy, at first by a provisional arrangement; then, in 1874, he demanded an increase of the force to 401,000 on a peace footing; he even wished to have a permanent appropriation made for this number of soldiers, and was with difficulty induced to accept a compromise. The Reichstag voted the provision for 401,000 men, for a period of seven years: this was called the "military septennate," with allusion to MacMahon's recently voted septennate in France. He also led them into voting for the military penal code, which the previous Reichstag had found too severe; also a series of criminal laws intended to reach the different kinds of opponents of the government (one of these was called the "rubber paragraph" from its elastic nature); also a press law abolishing the stamp and the deposit as security, but fixing severe penalties for attacks on the government.

The Liberal parties obtained only certain administrative, judicial, and economic reforms. In Prussia, in addition to lay inspection of schools and civil marriage, consequences of the *Culturkampf*, the reform of local administration, promised in 1814, was at last carried out in the eastern provinces. The House of Lords had always rejected it; it rejected it again in 1872, but in that year Bismarck induced the King to create twenty-five new members, and the law was then passed. It abolished the judicial and police powers of landowners on their domains, and changed the Circle assemblies into elected bodies, with power to impose taxes.

In the Empire the Reichstag and the government worked in concert to establish economic and judicial unity. The war indemnity of five thousand millions of francs paid by France made easy the economic arrangements. Several special funds were created—invalid pensions, war chest, fortresses, navy. A uniform currency was established in 1872, with the *mark* as the unit (= 24 cents). The old paper currency of the individual states was replaced with notes issued by the Imperial Treasury. An Imperial Bank was established. The customs duties on iron were almost wholly abolished (1873).

In the field of judicial reform, the individual governments rejected in the Federal Council the plan of a uniform system adopted by the Reichstag. Four years were necessary for reaching a compromise. A conference of ministers of the various states, then a commission of jurists, and finally a committee of the Reichstag, laboured over the matter. The results were a

common system of judicial procedure in civil matters, a general bankruptcy law, certain common principles of civil law, criminal procedure, and organization of courts.

The French war indemnity, distributed as repayment of outlays or expended on public works, had at first the effect of raising prices and wages and of stimulating speculative enterprises, particularly in the construction of railways and in the building of houses in Berlin. This was the period of "promoters" and of speculations in the stock-exchange. It ended abruptly in a panic and business depression (1874).

The Conservative party, dissatisfied with the reform of local administration, with the measures of free trade, with the withdrawal of the schools and the marriage ceremony from clerical hands, went over gradually into opposition to the government. It reproached Bismarck with "Germanizing" Prussia and with overturning the foundations of religion and society. Emperor William, who remained personally devoted to the church and the aristocracy, gave free scope to his Chancellor, while confessing to his intimate friends that his heart was full of misgivings. It seems that some of the Conservatives hoped to bring about Bismarck's fall and to set up in his place Count von Arnim, ambassador to France, a favourite at court backed by the Empress. The severe struggle between Bismarck and von Arnim led to a public explosion, the recall and arrest of von Arnim, followed by his trial and condemnation, first for wrongfully taking public documents from his embassy, and secondly for publishing an anonymous pamphlet against the Chancellor (1876). The Conservatives replied by a newspaper campaign against Bismarck. They accused him of being bought by Jew speculators, particularly Bleichroeder the banker, averring that he had opened "the Bleichroeder era" for Germany; hence new prosecutions.

Struggle against the Socialists (1878).—From the beginning of the Empire the government had combatted the Socialists by means of prosecutions. It had obtained in 1872 the condemnation of their two chiefs for high treason and in 1873 had prosecuted their journals in Berlin. But, perhaps because of the industrial distress following the panic of 1873, the Socialists made rapid gains among the working classes, especially in Saxony, Holstein, Thuringia, and Berlin. At the elections of 1874 they received 340,000 votes and then coalesced in a single party with a centralized management, an official journal, a treasury, and an annual congress.

Bismarck wished to check their agitation by laws against the press. But the Reichstag, anxious for liberty of the press, rejected his proposals. In 1877 the Socialists polled 480,000 votes.

The two attempts on the life of the Emperor in 1878 finally gave the government the means of overcoming the scruples of the liberal parties. The would-be assassins had acted on their own motion, and their party disavowed their acts: but they were Socialists. Bismarck took advantage of the public excitement caused by the second attempt on the Emperor's life to dissolve the Reichstag, with which he was already at variance on his economic policy. The liberal parties lost their majority; the new Reichstag voted the law against the Socialist agitators. This was an exceptional measure, expressly directed "against the subversive efforts of the social democrats." It forbade all associations, meetings, and publications having for their object "the subversion of the social order" or in which "socialistic tendencies should appear, of a kind to endanger the public peace and, in particular, the good understanding between the classes of the people." It gave the police power to seize socialistic publications and to prohibit or disperse socialistic meetings. It gave the governments power to proclaim for a year at a time, in any threatened city, the state of *minor siege*, which gave the administration the power of forbidding all meetings and of expelling every suspected person. The law was to be in force four years. Twice extended later, it lasted till 1890. It broke up the official organization of the Socialists, put an end to their clubs and their publications. According to statements issued by the party in 1890, the law had, in twelve years, suppressed 1400 publications, banished 900 persons, and condemned 1500 to prison. But the party had reorganized itself under the guise of local societies, outwardly innocent of political aims—such as choral societies, smokers' circles, workingmen's unions, etc. It had kept up the spread of its doctrines by private conversation and by means of flying sheets printed in secret. The publication of its official organ, the *Social Democrat*, was carried on from Zurich in Switzerland, whence it was smuggled into Germany. The socialist "Congress" was also held outside of Germany.

The repressive measures seemed at first to check the progress of socialism. At the elections of 1881 the party polled only 310,000 votes—electing 12 deputies. But in 1884 the number of voters rose to 550,000, and 24 socialists were elected. In 1887,

and 1890 the number of voters rose to 763,000 and 1,427,000, respectively. These results showed that repression was a failure.

Bismarck's Economic and Social Policy (1878-86).—In order to put down the Catholic clergy, Bismarck had allied himself with the National Liberals and had accepted their economic doctrines: a customs tariff approaching free trade, direct taxes for Imperial revenue, non-interference by the state in questions between labourers and employers. Little by little Bismarck became dissatisfied with this system; at the same time he was growing tired of his contest with the Catholic Church. He took up the new currents of thought that had begun to show themselves in Germany.

Certain professors of political economy, especially Wagner and Schmoller, advocates of state intervention in industrial matters, had founded in 1872 a "society for the study of social policy" (*Verein für Socialpolitik*). This body had instituted inquiries into the condition of the labourers, and was advocating a reform of the laws relating to labour, factory inspection, tenements, and life and accident insurance. Their opponents nicknamed them "Socialists of the chair."

The protectionists, aided by the depression of 1874, had started a movement for reform of taxation and a new commercial policy; they called for a restoration of the duties on iron, which had been nearly abolished in 1873. Bismarck became first a protectionist and then a state-socialist. He began by proposing a new tariff on imports (1877); a few years later he was advocating state interference with industry under the name of *Social policy*.

As early as 1877, the imperial budget being in a state of deficit, Bismarck proposed excise taxes on cards and tobacco. The National Liberal party demanded in return the creation of an Imperial ministry. Bismarck refused, took a vacation, and came back from it with a plan involving a fiscal revolution. Up to that time the Empire had had a low tariff, approximately free trade in principle, and slight excise taxes. The revenue from customs was not sufficient for the expenses of the Empire; the deficit had been made up by contributions demanded yearly from the various states according to population. Bismarck wished to have high duties, like other great states, in order to protect home industries; he therefore resolved to increase the imperial revenues from this source to a sufficient extent to get rid of the need of contributions. Within the Empire he wished to establish a monopoly of tobacco, on the model of France, and to increase the

excise duties. The imperial budget would then much more than balance; the surplus would be distributed to the states and would enable them to lower their direct taxes. This reform would give the Empire an independent revenue system; it would no longer have to "beg at the door of the states."

The project was rejected by the National Liberals, not only for its antagonism to free trade, but also because it would give the government a revenue independent of annual vote and would thus weaken still further the control of the Reichstag over the administration. Bismarck then abandoned the Liberals and sought a majority on the other side of the house, by coming to an understanding with the two conservative parties which he had just been fighting—the Prussian Conservatives and the Catholic Centre. Taking advantage of the attempts to assassinate the Emperor in 1878, he dissolved the Reichstag elected in 1877, the Liberal majority of which had just rejected his tobacco monopoly and his anti-Socialist bill. In the new Reichstag the Liberal parties, now become opponents of Bismarck, lost their majority. By a coalition of the Conservatives and Catholics, a new majority was formed, ready to accept a part at least of Bismarck's new economic program. It took at first the form of an "economic group," consisting of 204 members who declared themselves in favour of a protective tariff (1878).

Bismarck got this coalition to vote his new tariff. This was protectionist, without, however, raising the duties on foreign grain, although the landowners demanded protection. Bismarck thus carried some fragments of his program; it was done slowly and by a compromise. The Reichstag first voted the taxes on tobacco, coffee, and petroleum, but with the provision that the revenue from customs and excise beyond 130,000,000 of marks should be distributed to the states, and that certain of the taxes should be granted only for a year at a time, a condition intended to preserve the financial control of the Reichstag (1879).

In return for these favours, Bismarck granted his new allies a change of domestic policy in Prussia. He broke with his Liberal colleagues; Falk, the minister of the *Culturkampf*, gave way to a Conservative successor. He stopped the reform of local administration, which was opposed by the Conservatives. The reconciliation with the Centre was slower. It began with negotiations with the new Pope, Leo XIII., which, however, came to nothing. The questions were of filling the bishoprics and parishes vacated by deaths and exclusions: the May Laws re-

quired certain declarations which the ecclesiastics declined to make. An escape was found by the device of getting the Prussian Parliament to grant the government the power of dispensing with the requirements of the laws (1880). Thus ended the *Culturkampf*. Subsequently the measures adopted during the struggle were one by one withdrawn (1880-93). There remained only civil marriage and the repeal of the articles relating to the Church in the Constitution of 1850. The Catholic clergy are considered in Germany to have come out victorious in the contest with the government.

The coalition of the Conservatives and the Centre also voted the purchase of the Prussian railroads. Of 20,000 kilometers of road, 6000 kilometers belonged to the state. Bismarck proposed the purchase of all the roads by the government. He succeeded in purchasing them gradually, beginning in 1879.

In this change of policy the National Liberal party broke into two parts. One section, devoted above all to Bismarck, followed him and joined the Right (1879). Another section, attached to free trade and to the May Laws, joined the Left (1880), forming the *secession* of 28 members who eventually joined the Progress party (1881). This crisis brought manifestations of ill will on the part of Bismarck toward his former allies and ministerial colleagues, together with various flings at the Reichstag and at parliamentary government. He went so far as to propose biennial sessions for the Reichstag, and vote of the budget for a two-year period instead of annually. At the elections of 1881 the Liberal parties complained of the pressure put upon the voters to induce them to support the ministerial candidates.

In order to counteract the Socialist agitation Bismarck undertook to make the imperial government popular by establishing a government system of life and accident insurance, intended to better the condition of the labouring class. This was his "social policy."

He began by the creation, in November, 1880, of an Economic Council of 75 members for Prussia. Then he proposed a bill on accident insurance, announced as the first of a series. In November, 1881, the Emperor, in a famous message, laid down the principle that the state owes help to "its needy members," not only as "a simple duty of humanity and Christianity," but as "a task of self-preservation." It is necessary to "create even among the poor, who are the most numerous and the least instructed class, the conception of the state as an institution not

only necessary but benevolent." It was a development of the modern idea of the state, resulting from Christian morality, that "beyond the duty of defence, the state has the task put upon it . . . of promoting in positive ways the well-being of all its members, particularly the weak." This doctrine, represented by Bismarck as the old tradition of the Prussian Kings, was identical with the teachings of the theorists known as State Socialists, and of the new party calling themselves "Christian Socialists," which had just been founded by the court preacher, Stoecker.

The new principle was put in practice by slow instalments, painfully wrung from the Reichstag. A fund was created, under imperial management, for giving pensions to labourers disabled by accident, sickness, or old age. This institution was greeted by the university economists of Germany as a social revolution which was to save millions of labourers from suffering and interest them in the preservation of society. The Socialists treated it as a trick to divert the labourers from the pursuit of real reform. It does not seem, in fact, to have drawn the labourers to support the government.

In the Reichstag elected in 1881 the Liberal opposition appeared with increased numbers (Progressives, 58; Secession Liberals, 47). Bismarck made a closer alliance with the coalition of Conservatives and Catholics. He got, through its help, some fragments of his fiscal and social program and a law against the Anarchists. His tobacco monopoly was rejected.

During the same period he entered upon a colonial policy which, begun by the efforts of individuals and companies (1880), resulted in the creation of colonies aided by grants of money from the Reichstag. This was a new field for opposition; the Reichstag of 1884 pronounced against the colonial policy.

The Army Law and the "Cartel" (1886-88).—The coalition of Conservatives and Centre broke on the question of colonies. The Centre deserted Bismarck and joined the Progressives and other opposition parties to defeat the appropriations for colonial purposes. The rupture became final when the Prussian government, having expelled the Poles from the eastern provinces, refused to answer questions on the subject in Parliament. A coalition was formed to oppose Bismarck; it was led by the two chiefs of the Centre and the Progressives, and, as it included a majority of the Reichstag, it succeeded in defeating Bismarck's fiscal proposals.

German domestic politics were disturbed by external compli-

cations. This was the time of the Boulanger excitement and the Patriotic League in France; there was a feeling abroad that Germany was threatened with a war against France and perhaps Russia. Bismarck used these fears, which his adherents in the press seem to have fomented, to get the better of his opponents in the Reichstag. He asked, in 1886, for a renewal of the military septennate, although it did not expire till 1888, and an increase of 41,000 men in the army. The Progressives and Centre voted the increase, but limited the duration of the military law to three years. Bismarck dissolved the Reichstag in January, 1887.

At the elections of 1887 a coalition of all the parties favouring Bismarck was formed to oppose the enemies of the Septennate. The three parties, Conservatives, Imperialists, and National Liberals made a formal agreement (*Cartel*) to help each other at the second ballotings. (In Germany the second ballots are confined to a choice between the two candidates standing highest at the first ballot.) The elections, turning on the military question, resulted unfavourably for the opposition, and gave a considerable majority for the *Cartel*: 220 against 175.

With this new majority Bismarck controlled the Reichstag. He got his army law passed in 1888, got a renewal of the law against the socialists, and an extension of the duration of the Reichstag, from the three-year period fixed by the constitution to five years. He came to a direct understanding with the Pope, who consented to censure the Centre for opposing the army septennate; in return Bismarck got an act through the Prussian Parliament allowing religious orders to be restored in Prussia. And, finally, he succeeded in passing several bills embodying his "social policy."

William II. and Christian Socialism.—Bismarck had governed Prussia since 1862 and the Empire since its establishment. He had been the trusted adviser of William I. In all his contests with the Prussian Parliament, with the Reichstag, with colleagues in the Prussian ministry, with the Federal Council, his master had always sustained him. Frequently by threatening resignation, which William I. would never accept, he was able to crush opponents. He had come to be regarded as the necessary head of the government.

William I. died in March, 1888. His son and successor, Frederick III., was suffering with a fatal disease at the time of his accession. With him and his wife Victoria, daughter of the

English Queen, Bismarck had been in standing disagreement, as they were advocates of parliamentary government on the English pattern. The new reign was too short to change the policy of the government (Frederick died in June, 1888). But it raised at the new court an active movement against Bismarck. The struggle led to the publication of Frederick's III.'s diary for the years 1870-71, in which were some passages unfavourable to Bismarck. Bismarck had the editor prosecuted as a falsifier, but the result was an acquittal (1889).

William II. had been known as an admirer of his grandfather and Bismarck. He was an enthusiast for the army and the Church. His first utterances showed him to be a prince imbued with the military and religious spirit of the Prussian kings, a believer in the divine right of rulers, a pronounced enemy of the socialists and free-thinkers.

His first proclamation was to the army and navy. In his proclamation to the people he announced that he had assumed the government "in presence of the King of kings and had promised God to be a just and clement prince, to cultivate piety and the fear of God." In opening the Reichstag, he announced his intention of continuing the legislative work of his grandfather, particularly as to the things mentioned in his message of November, 1881: "protection of the labouring classes . . . according to the principles of Christian morality."

Then he adopted the practice of giving out his personal impressions on political matters in after-dinner speeches, impromptu discourses, answers to addresses, speeches to the recruits joining the army and navy, etc. Instead of the retired and sedentary life of his predecessors, he adopted a life of incessant movement and bustle: trips to all the monarchies of Europe, progresses through all parts of his empire, yachting trips over all the northern seas. In Berlin he got the nickname of William the External. He continued to show a passionate interest in the army, directing its exercises, assisting at its reviews and manœuvres in all parts of the empire.

His political utterances showed especially his respect for religion, his hatred of social revolution, his admiration for personal government and military discipline. After the success of the socialists at the elections of 1890, his references to the struggle against "the subversive elements" became menacing. In Silesia he expressed the wish that the "citizens might at length wake from their sleep and not leave the state and its organs to

fight the revolutionary elements singlehanded." He hoped there might be success in "re-establishing respect for the Church, respect for the law, and unquestioning obedience to the crown." At a dinner given to the Estates of the province of Brandenburg in 1890, he said: "The spirit of disobedience is abroad in the country. It uses an ocean of printer's ink and paper to obscure paths that are and ought to be clear to anybody who knows me and my principles." At Munich, in a visitor's album, he wrote: *Suprema lex regis voluntas esto* (Let the King's will be highest law). . . . To the recruits who had taken the military oath at Potsdam in November, 1891, he made an address regarding their duty in case of outbreak, in which he is reported to have said: "You are now my soldiers, you have given yourselves to me body and soul. There is now but one enemy for you, and that is my enemy. In these times of socialist intrigues it may happen that I shall order you to fire on your brothers and fathers. God save us from it! But in such a case you are bound to obey me without a murmur."

Meanwhile he intervened personally in special questions. He called an international conference to consider labour legislation. He took part in a school conference called to discuss a reform of secondary education, and expressed the opinion that more time ought to be given to modern subjects. He even sketched a plan for instruction in history which should begin with the events of our own time. . . .

At the beginning of his reign he allowed Bismarck to govern. But soon the change of sovereign brought a change in parties, and presently a change in the ministry.

The Conservative party, being in sympathy with the religious views of the Emperor, drew away from the alliance with the National Liberals, who were suspected of indifference to religion. The breach began in Prussia over a bill for making the primary schools free. The Conservatives joined the Catholics in opposing the bill, and defeated it (1888). Then the *Kreuzzeitung*, the organ of the Conservatives, openly attacked the *Cartel* as "anti-Christian," as a union of the "gold of Conservative principle with the baser metal of liberalism."

The Conservatives had as chiefs two leaders of the new conservative socialistic movement: Wagner, the economist representing state socialism; and Stoecker, the court preacher, founder of the "Christian Socialists." This party, started in 1878 as a workingman's party, announced that it "placed itself on the

foundation of Christian faith, love of the King and the fatherland, and rejected social democracy as impracticable, anti-Christian, and anti-patriotic." It was, therefore, a monarchical and ecclesiastical party, but it asked of the state profound social changes: compulsory corporations with aid from the state, labour legislation, inspection of factories, funds for insurance against accidents and sickness, a progressive tax on incomes and inheritances, regulation of the hours of labour. It opposed its program to those of the old Liberal parties, champions of industrial and commercial freedom, and declared itself the foe of the Manchester school and the Jews. Stoecker, although his following remained small, acquired an influence over the Conservatives by his unceasing campaign of agitation.

The Emperor stepped in to maintain the coalition between the Conservatives and National Liberals. He stopped Stoecker's political campaign, censured the *Kreuzzeitung*, and announced in the government organ that he regarded the Cartel as an arrangement favourable to the principles of his government. The Cartel was renewed for the elections of 1890, but without a common program. The electoral campaign was made against the enhancement of prices of provisions by the new imposts and against the tendency to reaction in religion shown by the ministerialists. It resulted in a complete defeat for the parties of the Cartel: they lost more than a third of their seats, getting only 135 instead of their previous 220; whereas the opposing parties came back with greatly increased strength.

The "New Course."—The government having lost its majority, Bismarck proposed to make up a new one by a coalition of Conservatives and Catholics. The Emperor refused. As early as 1889 a latent schism had begun between Bismarck and the personal friends of William II., especially Count Waldersee, chief of staff. Relations were already somewhat strained between the Emperor and the Chancellor, owing to the latter's dislike of the international conference regarding labour questions. On the Emperor's refusal to approve Bismarck's project of a new coalition, and Bismarck's refusal to forego the regulation of 1852, which forbade any Prussian minister to communicate with the King otherwise than through the Minister-President, confidential relations between them came to an end.

The rupture was abrupt and startling: Bismarck was asked to resign both his imperial chancellorship and his position as a Prussian minister. His successor, General Caprivi, was at once

installed (March, 1890). By a despatch couched in nautical terms, the Emperor announced the event and his intention to make no change in policy: "I am as much afflicted as if I had lost my grandfather anew; but we must endure whatever God sends us, even if we should have to die for it. The post of officer on the quarter-deck of the ship of state has fallen to me; the course remains unchanged. Forward with all steam!"

In point of fact, after Bismarck's retirement, the government policy took a somewhat different direction, which got named "the new course." It was at first a change in the personal relations between the Chancellor and the members of the Reichstag. The discussions, which had been bitter under Bismarck, whom the least contradiction irritated, became more calm under Caprivi. The latter declared himself ready to accept "ideas to which the too powerful personality of Bismarck was an obstacle." He allowed greater liberty of the press and of public meetings. Even the parties most opposed to his policy, the Progressives and Socialists, were less aggressive in their opposition. The exceptional law against the Socialists, which expired in 1890, was not renewed. The Socialist party reorganized itself openly, with its newspapers, its treasury maintained by contributions from its members, its "congresses" held in Germany, and its official body of managers. But it assumed a less revolutionary tone. The new government was helped by the easier mood of all the parties, relieved as they were of the feeling of compression from which they had suffered under the autocratic sway of Bismarck.

In commercial matters the new government, without returning to free trade, adopted a system of commercial treaties, at first with the allies of the Empire, Austria-Hungary and Italy (1891), then with other countries. The aim of the treaties was to open markets for the products of German manufactures and to avoid the embarrassments caused by sudden changes of tariffs on the part of customer countries.

This change of commercial policy was connected with a change of foreign policy. The government gave up the effort after a Russian alliance and took up a more friendly attitude toward the Poles. In Prussia it stopped the scheme for Germanizing Posen. Bismarck had tried to introduce there a German population by establishing a fund for the purchase of Polish estates—the lands to be sold again to German farmers. He had also tried to extirpate the Polish language from the primary schools. But it was shown that Polish, instead of receding, had gained

ground since 1860. The Catholic Poles were not becoming Germanized, and a part of the German population had become Polish in speech. The government made a reconciliation with its Polish subjects, gave them a Pole as archbishop, and received Polish nobles with favour at the court in Berlin. The Poles, perhaps out of hatred for Russia, became friendly to the Prussian government. Both in the Prussian Parliament and in the Reichstag, the Polish party, hitherto in systematic opposition, became steadfast supporters of the government.

Meanwhile the policy of coalition with the Catholic Centre, which Bismarck had urged, had been forced on the government. The Conservatives refused to support its plan of communal reform; the National Liberals were opposed to its labour legislation and the increase of army expenditure. Caprivi made terms for the support of the Centre. He granted it, in 1890, a law relieving persons studying for the priesthood from the obligation of military service (the Protestant theological students asked not to be included). In return the Centre voted for the two measures long discussed in Prussia—the reform of the national income tax and the reform of local administration in the eastern provinces (1891). The first adopted the principle of a slightly increasing rate on incomes above 30,000 marks (\$7,200), using the taxpayer's declaration as a basis of proceeding. A portion of the increased proceeds from the income tax was to be turned over to the communes in order to lighten local taxes. The act regarding local administration at length completed the reform begun in 1808 by creating in the eastern provinces, not communes on the French plan (the villages being too small and poor), but unions on the English plan, for certain special objects—roads, schools, poor relief.

On a question relating to the Prussian school system, a coalition was made between the two parties favourable to clerical influence—the Protestant Conservatives and the Catholic Centre. The government proposed to suppress mixed schools and to make all education sectarian; the ordinary teachers to give the religious instruction, but under licenses granted by ecclesiastical authorities, and subject to revocation by the same. All the other parties joined in opposition to the scheme. In the debate the ministers declared that the issue was between Christianity and atheism. The universities and city councils sent up protests against the measure. The Emperor, shaken by the widespread opposition, withdrew his support of the bill. A ministerial crisis

followed. Caprivi wished to resign, but was only relieved of his position as head of the Prussian ministry—retaining his office of Imperial Chancellor (March, 1892).

The Conservatives, disappointed in the Emperor, turned to the anti-Semites, who, under the name of Social Reform, were gaining support among the lower middle class. A gathering of Conservatives adopted a declaration that "the Church and the state are divine institutions between which a cordial co-operation is necessary for cherishing the life of the people. . . . We are opposed to the influence of the Jews which has fastened itself on the country and is devouring its life." Bismarck, in retirement on his estates, carried on a petty warfare of newspaper articles and interviews against his successor. He reproached him with having compromised the safety of the Empire by alienating Russia, and with sacrificing the interests of German producers by abandoning protection. His trip to Vienna in 1892 was the occasion of ovations half intended as censures of the government; public servants were forbidden to take part in them.

Against the commercial policy of the government, a new economic party was formed, which had its following chiefly among the Conservatives of eastern Prussia. Their grievance was the low price of farm products in 1892. They took the name of the "Farmers' League." The leader of the movement, an obscure farmer of Silesia, said in his published statement: "We must give up being Liberals, Ultramontanes, and Conservatives; we must unite in one great Farmers' Party, to try and get more influence over parliaments and legislation." The party organized local branches, with a central bureau and a membership fee equal to three per cent. of the member's land tax. Its platform demanded a protective tariff on agricultural products, free coinage of silver, the institution of Chambers of Agriculture, supervision of corn exchanges. The party opposed the commercial treaty, made in 1894, with Russia; it demanded that the importation of foreign grain be made a government monopoly.

The government, attacked by the Conservatives, was supported, somewhat hesitatingly, by the Progressives and the Centre. The harmony, such as it was, came to an end on the new military question. As in 1860, the population had increased and the existing regiments were no longer sufficient to receive all the recruits; there were 60,000 in excess. The government asked for an appropriation for 100,000 additional soldiers; but,

in contrast with the course taken in 1860, it proposed to reduce, conditionally, the term of active service in the infantry from three years to two. The Progressives refused the additional appropriation, except on condition that the reduction of service be made final. The Centre asked for concessions in ecclesiastical matters as a condition of its support. The bill was rejected in May, 1893, and the Reichstag was dissolved.

At the elections of 1893 the Progressives fell apart on the army question, some of them favouring the government's scheme, the rest opposing it and trying to combine with the democratic party of southern Germany; they returned from the elections greatly reduced in strength. Most of the other parties gained some seats—a fact which enabled the government to carry the army law, by 11 majority, in the new Reichstag.

The greatest success, however, was won by the Socialists. No other party received so many votes—1,786,000, instead of the 1,427,000 received in 1890. The next most numerous party, the Conservatives, received only 1,038,000 votes. The Socialists carried only 44 seats, but this was because the districting was unfavourable to them. The districts remain as they were made in 1867-71; but the large cities and manufacturing regions, in which the Socialists have their chief strength, have greatly increased in population since that date.

The struggle against the Socialists became the Emperor's chief concern. In a prepared speech at Königsberg he said: "Gentlemen, to you I address my appeal: stand up and fight for religion, morality, and order against the champions of subversion!" The government prepared a "bill against subversion," which became an occasion of difficulty between Chancellor Caprivi and Eulenburg, head of the Prussian ministry: the result was that both retired from office, in October, 1894.

The new Chancellor, Hohenlohe, proposed a bill creating new penalties for inciting soldiers to disobedience, or attacking religion, the monarchy, marriage, the family, or property. The Conservatives and the Catholics accepted the principle of the bill; but in the debate in the Reichstag attacks were made on the universities and their "socialists of the chair," which annoyed the Liberal-Conservatives. Later the committee of the Reichstag amended the bill to suit the Catholics. All the other parties united in defeating it (May, 1895).

The Conservative party, already deeply affected by the introduction of the Farmers' Party, and by the understanding with the

anti-Semites, was shaken by a schism among the Christian Social party. In opposition to the aristocratic element, Parson Naumann had drawn away the mass of the party to support a democratic policy of "aiding the labouring class to organize itself and attain equality on a Christian basis." By demanding that farm labourers should have the right to form unions, he brought on a rupture with the great landowning Conservatives and the *Kreuzzeitung*, which denounced him as an ally of the Socialists. The Emperor pronounced publicly against the Christian Social party. "Political parsons," he said, "are a monstrosity. Whoever is a Christian is also social." The Anti-Semites had already declared themselves a party of the people, hostile to squires and country gentlemen. It would seem, then, that the Conservatives are getting drawn into a democratic evolution.

Alsace-Lorraine.—The region taken from France in 1871 has been kept ever since in an exceptional condition, which makes necessary a separate sketch of its history. The region includes three districts corresponding roughly to the three French departments: Upper Alsace (*Haut-Rhin*), a manufacturing district, by majority Catholic; Lower Alsace (*Bas-Rhin*), agricultural, and by majority Protestant; Lorraine (*Moselle*), agricultural and wholly Catholic. Most of Lorraine is French in language and ignorant of German. In the rest and in Alsace a dialect of German is spoken, very hard for a North German to understand—in Upper Alsace, impossible.*

According to Prussian practice, the country was annexed without consulting the inhabitants. Bismarck seems to have had a hope of conciliating them easily. He said in the Reichstag in 1871, while admitting the repugnance of the Alsace-Lorrainers to the union with Germany: "It is our duty to overcome it by our patience. I feel myself called on to be their advocate in the new state they are entering." In order to keep the country under his own hand, he had it erected into an Imperial Land (*Reichsland*), governed directly by the Chancellor of the Empire. It is represented in the Reichstag by elected deputies, but not represented in the Federal Council, because it has no state government of its own. It is subject to the laws of the Empire, but retains its own special laws—the French laws in force before the annexation.

Provisionally Alsace-Lorraine remained under a dictatorship,

* The German Census of 1880 gives 44 of the 855 communes in Alsace as French-speaking; and for Lorraine 341 French as against 370 German

governed autocratically by the agents of the Chancellor. The administration continued to be organized on the French plan, with a President instead of prefects, *Kreisdirectors* instead of sub-prefects, *Burgermeisters* instead of Maires; the local councils of the French system were retained. But instead of the twelve arrondissements of the French rule there were 22 Circles (*Kreise*) made. All the officials appointed by the Chancellor were Germans.

Troubles soon began between the inhabitants and the administrative officers on the subject of language and various French demonstrations. The administration worked systematically to extirpate French from the schools, from official proceedings, and from public institutions, including the railroads, now become state property; it was even forbidden on signs and posters. Fine and imprisonment were used to repress manifestations of sympathy with France in any form. Journals with French tendencies and journals coming from France were suppressed. The people complained that the German officials, accustomed to a precise and patriarchal system, made their administrative attentions oppressively felt by the subjects; the officials charged the inhabitants with treating them as infected persons and "boycotting" them.

Then came the contest regarding option. The treaty of Frankfurt gave the inhabitants of the annexed provinces the right of choosing to be French citizens. At the end of the time given for choice (October, 1872) the number choosing French nationality was 164,000. But the government announced that it should regard the option as valid only when followed by emigration; it treated as German subjects all who remained in the country.

The introduction of the German military system brought other conflicts. Many young Alsace-Lorrainers, not willing to serve Germany, took refuge in France. . . The German government held their families responsible.

The trouble connected itself with the *Culturkampf*. The Alsatian clergy tried to keep French in the Catholic schools. A society, with French connections, was founded for the defence of Catholic interests. The government expelled the vicar-general of Strasburg.

The dictatorship, continued to 1874, had succeeded in giving Alsace-Lorraine a German administration, but had not made it acceptable to the people. The government at length decided to admit the Imperial Province to the benefits of ordinary law.

Alsace-Lorraine was put under the legislative power of the Empire, and was given 15 representatives in the Reichstag. The first delegation, elected in 1874, was entirely composed of "Protesters." They went to the Reichstag to present a collective protest against the annexation of their country to Germany, and to demand that the people should be allowed to decide their fate themselves. They then retired from the body.

Later there was formed in Alsace-Lorraine a party which, instead of protesting against the German government, aimed to make terms with it in order to have the *régime* of conquest relaxed. Its avowed object was to obtain autonomy for Alsace-Lorraine; that is, the right to regulate its domestic affairs and have elected representatives and a budget, like the German states of the Empire. This Autonomist party had its strength chiefly in Protestant Lower Alsace. It began operations in the departmental councils, where the Protesters, in order to avoid taking the oath of allegiance to the Emperor, refused to sit. In 1874 out of 94 councillors elected 49 refused to sit. In 15 cantons no elections were held. But the Autonomists were willing to sit, a fact which enabled the government to open one of the three councils—that of Lower Alsace. To strengthen this party, the government instituted a Provincial Committee (*Landesausschuss*), consisting of 30 delegates, 10 from each department, with a right to be consulted in the legislation, taxes, and expenditure of the province. It is the embryo of a future legislature for Alsace-Lorraine.

The Autonomists, openly encouraged by the administration, took charge of the Committee, the Protesters refusing to sit, and entered into working relations with the government. It took up the discussion of practical affairs, avoiding questions of national policy. The party became strong enough to elect, in 1877, the whole five members of the Reichstag for Lower Alsace. The government, thinking reconciliation with the annexed population had begun, resolved to adopt a new system, the third since 1871.

The Provincial Committee received power, in 1877, to vote laws and the budget. The government, thereafter, could choose between this body and the Reichstag in getting legislation adopted for Alsace-Lorraine. Presently the administration was transferred from Berlin to Strasburg; an Imperial governor (*Statthalter*) was appointed, assisted by a Secretary of State and a Council composed of higher officials, and ten or more notables

chosen by the government—an institution that may develop into an upper House. The province was even given a delegate to represent it in the Federal Council of the Empire—without the right of voting, however. The Autonomists were beginning to demand complete equality with the other states of the empire: Alsace-Lorraine should be transformed into an Imperial state (*Kaiserland*), in which the Emperor should be the local prince.

The first Statthalter, General Manteuffel, arrived with a program of reconciliation. He said: "The Emperor has sent me to your country to heal wounds, not to make them. I am to conciliate the feelings that are quite natural after separation from a country like France. I am to smooth the change by an administration both just and advantageous to the intellectual and material interests of the inhabitants." Manteuffel did, in fact, try, by acts of good-will and by an administration that he considered fatherly, to reconcile the people to the government. But the existence of the Autonomist party rested on a misapprehension; the Autonomists could carry elections only by confining their policy to a recognition of the fact of German rule, without in any way accepting it as legitimate. At the elections of 1881, Manteuffel asked of them "a loyal and open recognition of the union of Alsace-Lorraine with Germany." The party was shattered by the suggestion; none but Protesters were elected.

The German government, without changing institutions, reverted to the methods of the early years—the discretionary power of the officials and the repression of popular manifestations. The conflict with the people went on. The administration, in order to turn the minds of the children away from France, prohibited the teaching of French in the schools; confiscated French newspapers; excluded, or limited to a few days' stay, Frenchmen, even Alsatians by birth, who had been naturalized in France.

The elections of 1887 showed the feeling of the people.* The question in the canvass was the new army bill (see p. 501). The government gave out that a vote against the supporters of the bill would be a vote in favour of an invasion by France. The voters got the impression that the election was a sort of plebiscite between Germany and France, and cast a full vote for the Protesting candidates. The government sharpened its repression; it expelled Frenchmen, even one who had been elected to the Reichstag; confiscated newspapers, dissolved societies

*The state of feeling in Alsace is well described by an Alsatian (under the pseudonym *Heimweh*) in *La Question d'Alsace*, 1889.

suspected of French leanings, prosecuted persons carrying anything blue, white, and red on their persons, and brought members of the Patriotic League to trial for high treason. In 1888, in order to check intercourse with France, it restored the old system of passports; reviving certain exceptional French laws of 1795 to 1814, which had become obsolete; it demanded passports of travellers entering by the French frontier. Chancellor Caprivi explained in 1890 that "the experiment of Germanizing the people having failed, there was left only the resource of deepening the ditch that divides Alsace-Lorraine from France." Passports were discontinued in 1891, but the discretionary power of the Statthalter suffices to maintain the exceptional system.

In the Reichstag of 1893. Protestation took new forms. One socialist deputy was elected, and the Catholic deputies from Alsace-Lorraine joined the Centre.

Political Development of Germany in the Nineteenth Century.

—The people of Germany, when released from the French invasion, were sufficiently uniform in language and customs to feel themselves one nation and to desire political unity. But they had not all reached the same stage of political advancement and they were subject to governments that were hostile to union. The west, revolutionized by France, had a democratic social system, free from clerical control, and an administration subject to law; they needed only representative institutions at the top. The east, retaining eighteenth-century conditions, had still the official power of the nobles and clergy, with traditional customs and administrative methods that would ill accord with any other government than that of an absolute, aristocratic monarchy. Now, the two dominant governments, Austria and Prussia, both having their political centre in the east, checked, by their absolutist and aristocratic polity, the development of Germany toward a liberal system. By their rivalry they checked progress toward unity. This double clash between the democratic west and the aristocratic east, and between Austria and Prussia, explains the confused and conflicting agitations and the evolution of German political life in the nineteenth century.

For more than thirty years (1814-48) political life was centred in the west. A number of small monarchies, with liberal constitutions copied from France, were formed in that region. Their natural destiny seemed to be to form a federation of small parliamentary states like Belgium. During this time Prussia, by organizing her army on a democratic principle and by building

up the Customs Union, was preparing the means for obtaining a military and economic supremacy in Germany.

The revolution of 1848 consisted in two democratic outbreaks of the French sort in the two absolutist capitals, and an attempt of all German Liberals to form a national union by means of a democratic federal assembly. The two risings compelled the governments of Vienna and Berlin to accept democratic liberal constitutions; the federal assembly adopted one for Germany. But the absolute sovereigns presently swept away with their armies the new democratic *régime* and got rid of the new constitutions by *coups d'état*. The Emperor of Austria cancelled his; the King of Prussia mutilated his to the point of making it little more than a form of governmental procedure. The democratic federal constitution was brushed aside by Prussian troops, in a movement that also broke up the Republican party of the west. From this whole abortive experiment of 1848 there remained in Prussia a wreck of a democratic constitution and the independence of the Catholic Church; there remained also a plan of German unity, elaborated by the Smaller Germany party in 1849—a federal empire, from which Austria should be excluded, governed by the King of Prussia with a democratic assembly representing all Germany.

When the absolutist and anti-union reaction came to an end in 1859, political life began again in two parallel movements, the one toward liberal parliamentary government, the other toward a union of all Germany, including Austria. The two movements were abruptly checked by the personal action of Bismarck. Relying on the King of Prussia and the Prussian army, he imposed on Prussia the monarchical solution of the parliamentary struggle and on Germany the Prussian solution of German unity formulated in 1849. Both solutions were compromises between the popular wishes and the royal power, but compromises dictated by the King of Prussia, who reserved for himself the greater share of the advantage.

The German Empire, a compromise between a federation of the German nation and annexation of Germany to Prussia, was made up of German states and of Prussian conquests old and new, inhabited in part by aliens (Poles, Danes, and Alsace-Lorrainers); it was put under the government of the King of Prussia. *Germania*, it was said, is a daughter of *Borussia*, not of *Teutonia* (ancient Germany).

The constitutional system in Prussia and in the Empire is a

compromise between the liberal democracy of 1848 and the absolute monarchy of old Prussia. It is a personal government of the King, who retains all his bureaucratic and military apparatus, slightly controlled by a democratic representative assembly.

In this imperial democratic system, parties have not succeeded in constituting themselves with the same gradation as in the other great Continental states. The continuous chain which elsewhere extends from the Catholic extreme Right to the socialist extreme Left, is broken in Germany by the absence of the radical republican party, which was exterminated in 1849 and is represented only by the wreck called the People's party. The elements which would normally belong to a radical party are therefore obliged to join the socialists, who thus acquire exceptional strength. On the other hand, the Right is twofold, for the so-called "Centre" is politically a Catholic Right, a pendant of the Protestant Conservative Right, both of them champions of a monarchy in alliance with the Church.

German society, since the founding of the Empire, seems drawn in two opposite directions by two conflicting tendencies. The one is monarchical, bureaucratic, and military; springing from the Prussian government, it tends to mould all Germany on the Prussian model, by extending to it the old *régime* of divine right and ecclesiastical authority. The other tendency is democratic, springing from the new populations of the great cities and manufacturing districts, but now beginning to extend to the rural sections and to affect even the Conservatives through the Agrarian, Anti-Semitic, and Christian Social agitations. Between these two tendencies—the one monarchical, ecclesiastical, and military, incarnate in William II.; the other democratic, anti-clerical, and industrial—the contradiction is so evident that it brings on the whole political life of Germany a confused but undeniable unrest.*

* The German Empire has become since 1871 the second country of Europe in industry and commerce, and begins to compete with England in the production of coal, iron, and fabrics. The total population has risen from 42,000,000 in 1875 to 52,000,000 in 1895. The total urban population has, in the same period, increased from 36 per cent. to 47 per cent. of the whole. The population of Berlin has trebled in thirty years; it was 500,000 in 1860.

BIBLIOGRAPHY.*

* On the character of this bibliography, see chap. xii.

BIBLIOGRAPHY.—See **Waitz**, "Quellenkunde," up to 1894; for very recent works, the periodical bibliog. of the "Deutsche Zeitschrift für Geschichtswissenschaft."

DOCUMENTS.—For collections, same bibl. as for chap. xv.—The principal documents are parliamentary reports, **Hahn, Kohl**; in addition, **Foschinger**, "Documente zur Gesch. der Wirthschaftspolitik in Preussen und im Deutschen Reich," 5 vols., 1889-91, collection for the history of Bismarck's ideas and political economy.

For practical use, important documents will be found in **Schulthess'** "Geschichtskalender," edited by **Delbrück**, from 1885 to 1894.—To the reviews already mentioned ("Grenzboten, Preuss. Jahrbücher") add the "Deutsche Rundschau," since 1874, liberal; "Deutsche Revue," since 1877; "Die Neue Zeit," since 1883, socialist.—**Mueller**, "Das Jahr," pub. yearly since 1875.

WORKS.—The complete histories go only to 1890.—**Oncken**, "Zeitalter des K. Wilhelm, vol. ii., 1892 (Oncken coll.) a scientific popular work, stops at 1888.—**H. Blum**, "Das Deutsche Reich zur Zeit Bismarcks," 1893, goes to 1890; Blum is an intimate friend of Bismarck.—The "Geschichtskalender" gives at the end of each volume a political review of the year, from the point of view of the National-Liberals.

On Bismarck see his own "Gedanken und Erinnerungen," 2 vols., 1898; Eng. tr. by A. J. Butler, 1899. **Busch**, "Bismarck: Some Secret Pages of his History," 2 vols., 1898. Eng. tr. by Macmillan; "Unser Reichskanzler," 2 vols., 1884, Eng. tr. "Our Chancellor"; and the series of studies signed ** (**Waitz**, "Quellenk.," No. 6461). In English, **Lowe**, "Life of Bismarck," 2 vols., rather journalistic.—The biographies of William I., (**W. Müller**, 1888; **L. Hahn**, 1888) are the work of hero-worshippers.

In French: **E. Simon**, "L'Empereur Guillaume," 1886.—**Lavisse**, "Trois Empereurs d'Allemagne," 1888.

ON THE KULTURKAMPF: **L. Hahn**, "Gesch. des Kulturkampfes in Preussen," 1881, collection of documents, prot. and governmental.—**F.-X. Schulte**, "Gesch. des Kulturk. in Preussen," 1882, Catholic.—**Majunke**, "Gesch. des Kulturk. in Preussen und Deutschland," 1876-88, Catholic.

ON INSTITUTIONS: **Marquardsen**, "Handbuch des Öffentlichen Rechts der Gegenwart," vols. i. and iii., detailed description of the government and administration of the Empire and of each of the States.—For Prussia, **Bornhak**, "Gesch. des Preussischen Verwaltungsrechts," suppl. 1892.—**Rönne**, "Staatsrecht der Preussischen Monarchie," 4 vols., latest edit. and the suppl. of **Schoen**, "Recht der Kommunalverbände in Preussen" (1897), for the latest reforms.—In English, **W. H. Dawson**, "Germany and the Germans," 2 vols., 1894; **Lowell**, "Governments and Parties in Continental Europe," 2 vols., 1897.

ON SOCIAL LEGISLATION: Detailed articles and special bibl. in "Handwörterbuch der Staatswissenschaften."

ON THE SOCIALIST PARTY: See bibl. to chap. xxiv.

CHAPTER XVII.

THE CONSTITUTIONAL SYSTEM IN AUSTRIA.

AFTER the war with Italy, Austria emerged from her absolutism, but, before becoming the constitutional dual monarchy of Austro-Hungary, she passed through a critical period, from 1859 to 1867, during which even the constitution of the monarchy remained in a provisional and precarious condition, many times transformed and always contested by some of the nations subject to the Emperor. It is a short period in the history of Austria, but very clearly marked and decisive, between the old centralized absolutist system and the Austro-Hungary of the present day.

FORMATION OF AUSTRO-HUNGARY.

The Constitution of October, 1860.—The absolutist system, restored in 1849, fell in the disastrous Italian war of 1859; the government itself had to recognise the necessity of abandoning it. For a long time the government had existed with a chronic deficit, which it covered by loans. After its defeat, when it wished to reorganize the army, it found its credit gone (in 1860 only 75,000,000 florins were subscribed in response to a call for a loan of 200,000,000). Evidently the subjects had lost their interest in state affairs, in which they had no part whatever. To revive public life the people must be given a share in the government.

The Emperor, immediately after the end of the war, recognised in a manifesto (August, 1859) the "hereditary abuses" which had caused the defeat, and before issuing the loan of 1860 he determined to appeal directly to his subjects, asking their aid in exchange for liberal reforms. He announced that he would grant representation to the various provinces of the monarchy. Meanwhile he convoked a "re-enforced Council of State" (*verstärkter Reichsrath*), comprising the ordinary members of the Council of State, a number of dignitaries, and 38 notables (including several grand seigneurs) chosen from the different countries in such manner that all were represented.

This Council, where the office-holders and aristocracy predominated, was to give its opinion especially on financial questions and the most important laws, but it had no right of proposing measures. Austrians regarded it simply as an instalment of the promised reforms. The notables that were summoned, even the Hungarian nobles, attended the meetings, but simply as a mark of their good-will. Further, it was necessary, in order to induce them to come, to re-establish a single governor instead of four, and to promise the restoration of the county "congregations" (assemblies), as before the reaction of 1849.

In the "re-enforced council" the Hungarians declared "that they did not regard themselves as representative Hungarians, that they reserved the *historic rights* of Hungary, and counted on the Emperor to find a means of abandoning the special system." A committee was then appointed to examine the budget. It unanimously condemned "the system of internal organization in the monarchy" and demanded that "the different countries should share in the administration of their affairs," as the only means of effecting economies and especially of combating "that numbness of public spirit which paralyzes the moral force of the state."

But on the organization of this administration by the countries themselves the committee was divided, and from the time of this first assembly, though so narrow and so little representative, two parties appeared, the unitarian and the federalist, whose strife was henceforth to rule political life in the Austrian monarchy.

The unitarian party had its chief force in the middle classes of the German provinces, for "the maintenance of the unity of the monarchy" meant government by the German administration established in Vienna; this was the party of the cities and manufacturing regions, which had need of a strong central government to make liberal reforms and to restore a lay *régime* in spite of the clergy. They had for allies the representatives of the little nations, who needed a central government to protect them against their stronger neighbours; in 1860 there were no small nations represented except those of Hungary: the Servians, and the Saxons in Transylvania; but the others, when they should get a voice in the assemblies, were sure to pursue the same policy.

The federalist party was mainly composed of nations that were strong enough to hope for national governments independent of the centre: Magyars, Croats, Czechs, Poles, and Slovens (in 1860

the Italians of Venetia). It demanded the *historic rights*, that is to say, the independence enjoyed by the nation before its union with the monarchy, and wished to weaken if not suppress the common administration and reduce the monarchy to a federation of nations. As the aristocratic form of society still prevailed, each nation was represented almost solely by its nobles and higher clergy. The federalist party was also an old-*régime* party, invoking historic rights in order to return to the old aristocratic government of the nation and wishing to maintain the domination of nobility and clergy. Its allies in the German province were the old-*régimists*,—the lords, who opposed the bourgeoisie, and the clergy, who opposed purely lay government.

The committee split into a majority and a minority; each presented its report, in which already it made use of expressions which were destined to become classic in Austria.*

The federalist majority (25 votes, of which 13 belonged to nobles, 3 to bishops) demanded "recognition of the historico-political individualities of the particular countries," "equality of all the countries within the monarchy," and for each "autonomy in administration and internal legislation." It advised that reform should be confined as much as possible to "previous institutions." The unitarian minority (13 votes) demanded that home rule should not be granted "at the expense of imperial unity and a strong central imperial power," and that in granting local powers "those rights should be reserved to the united state and to the imperial government, without which true imperial unity cannot be conceived." It advised the Emperor to establish these institutions "by virtue of his own full power," consequently to present them as *granted* in opposition to the theory of historical rights, which demanded them as the restoration of an old national right. It neglected to define the institutions to be created, not daring to speak of a "constitution," which was then regarded as revolutionary.

The Emperor at first followed the advice of the majority. By the diploma of October 20, 1860, he granted a "fundamental state law, permanent and irrevocable." This diploma recognised in the Diets of the various countries the power of voting laws, in accordance with historic forms. "In the countries under the crown of Hungary, action must be in conformity with their pre-

* The majority of these expressions, composed in the philosophic language of the German political law, cannot well be translated correctly into French.

vious constitutions"; in the others, in conformity with their local ordinances. For the case of laws common to the whole Empire, and especially on financial matters (taxes, loans, budgets, and accounts) an Imperial Council of 100 members was instituted, composed of delegates from the various Diets. The Emperor abolished the common ministers of interior, justice, and education and re-established the chancelleries of Hungary and Transylvania. He declared that institutions must "correspond to the consciousness of historic rights" of his "kingdoms and nations." This was the official recognition of the federalist theory.

The Constitution of 1861.—This first federalist constitution lasted four months. The Hungarians, restored to the possession of their constitution, declared null all acts done by the government without the consent of their Diet since 1848. They recognised no other constitution but that of '48, no other laws but those of '48, the only ones legally established by agreement between the Diet and the King. Now the *régime* of 1848 made Hungary an entirely independent state, joined to Austria by a simply *personal union*. The Emperor did not wish to go so far, since he created a legislative assembly common to all the states, including Hungary; but in restoring the Hungarian constitution he had forgotten to fix limits to what he granted them.

The Hungarians immediately conducted themselves as if the Constitution of '48 were still in force. The counties organized themselves, and conducted elections according to the laws of 1848, in spite of the government circulars issued to them, which they received and "deferentially" set aside. The people refused to pay taxes (because they were not voted by the Diet) or to obey Austrian magistrates. The imperial government and governors of the counties had no means of opposing this general movement. The Emperor complained of the condition of affairs and threatened not to convoke the Diet again. The counties replied with an address demanding the complete restoration of the laws of '48 and full amnesty for all who had taken part in the revolution (January, 1861).

Schmerling, the new minister of the interior (December, 1860), had just promised that the other countries in the monarchy should have Diets chosen by direct election, with public sessions and the right of proposing laws—which meant a constitutional government for each country. But the liberal bourgeoisie desired a like system for the general government. The minister of finance consulted the chambers of commerce on the means of

raising the very low value of paper money; all replied that a "real constitution" was the only way of curing "hereditary abuses."

The Emperor, unwilling to yield to Hungary and worried over the financial situation, adopted the advice of the unitary minority and promulgated a new constitution, the "patent" of February 26, 1861, which, while pretending to complete the diploma of 1860, replaced it with an altogether different system. Each country was to keep its Diet, organized by a special ordinance; Venetia and the countries under the crown of Hungary were not included. In the other countries the Diet was to be elected, according to class divisions, by three bodies of electors as the Prussian Provincial Estates were before 1848,—large landowners, cities, and rural districts,—so as to give a strong preponderance to the landed aristocracy. But the Imperial council became an actual annual parliament of the monarchy, comprising two Chambers. The *House of Lords* was composed of a number of dignitaries and hereditary lords appointed by the Emperor. The *House of Representatives* was to have 343 members chosen by the local Diets (Hungary 85, Transylvania 20, Croatia 9, Bohemia 54, Moravia 22, Galicia 38), reserving to the government the right of having them directly elected if necessary, by electoral bodies; this provided for the case of a Diet refusing to elect.

The Emperor promulgated "this collection of fundamental laws as the *Constitution* of his Empire" and promised that he and his successors should "maintain it inviolable" and that, at each accession, a special oath to this effect should be made by proclamation. By this granted constitution Austria became a constitutional monarchy after the Tory conception: the Emperor to choose his ministers at will and retain absolute control of the government; the council to have power only to vote laws and the budget, like the Chambers of Louis XVIII.

Attempt at a Unitary Government (1861-65).—The Constitution of 1861 answered the wishes of the unitary party, and received the support of the German liberals and the small nations: Serbs and Roumans, under the crown of Hungary; Ruthenians in Galicia, and Croats in Dalmatia. It displeased the aristocratic federalist party, and the strongly constituted nations, by subjecting them to an assembly common to the whole Empire, and the old-régimists by establishing a liberal constitutional system.

But the coalition that had composed the majority in 1860 broke up. The more independent nations declared the constitu-

tion contrary to their historic rights; consequently they refused to elect delegates to the *Reichsrath*; the Magyars, the Italians in Venetia, and the Croats held no elections and were not represented. But the other federalist nations did not at first dare to adopt such a radical policy; the Poles, Czechs, and Slovenians sent their deputies, but held to their historic rights. (In Istria and Transylvania the Diets had first refused; the government, by dissolving the Diet and changing the electoral law, secured a majority in favour of holding an election). The Tyrol, where the clerical party predominated, protested against equality in creed, and demanded the prohibition of Protestantism, but sent delegates nevertheless. The decisive action was taken by the great landowners, who were very strongly represented in the Diets. They deserted their federalist allies to obey the government. The *Reichsrath* was not complete; it lacked 140 deputies, but it was sufficiently large to take legal action as the "narrower council" for the non-Hungarian part of the Empire. Later, in 1863, when the government had organized the Diet of Transylvania, the Saxons, who were opposed to the Magyars, sent their deputies to the *Reichsrath*, and the Emperor declared it constituted as the "larger council," competent to direct the affairs of the whole monarchy.

The constitutional system began with a German ministry under Schmerling, who had been an imperial minister in 1848, an old liberal and German patriot. His policy was marked particularly by liberal and German declarations. This was the period of negotiations with the German states (1863; see p. 465). The House of Representatives of the *Reichsrath*, where the majority was German, approved this policy and voted an address begging the Emperor to tighten the tie with the German states.

This system at first met with resistance from nations unwilling to be governed by Germans, then from the Germans themselves who did not find the government sufficiently liberal.

The national resistance began in Venetia and in Hungary. The *Central Congregation*, or provincial assembly of Venetia, refused to send its delegates (1861). The Hungarian Diet, convoked by the government at Ofen (opposite Pesth), consented to hold a meeting. But immediately, on the question of the answer to be made to the Emperor, it broke into two almost equal parties. One wanted to reply by a *decision* of the Diet indicating that Hungary would not consent even to a discussion, but demanded the restoration of the Constitution of '48. The other, directed

by the old liberals, Déâk and Eötvös, proposed to adopt the more conciliatory form of an *address* to the King protesting against the new constitution. After three weeks of discussion the "address party" won the victory over the "decision party" (155 votes against 152). But the address was drafted in the form of a decision; instead of addressing itself to the King (according to Hungarian custom) the Diet used the term "Most gracious *lord*," indicating that it did not recognise the abdication of Ferdinand and Francis Joseph's accession. The Emperor refused to receive the address. The Diet consented to adopt the form of 1790, but at the same time declared that "the King of Hungary could legally become King only by coronation," and that coronation rested on certain *previous* conditions: 1. The union of the countries under the crown of Hungary (Croatia and Transylvania), whose deputies should sit in the Hungarian Diet; 2. The "complete restoration of the fundamental laws," which meant the Constitution of '48; 3. The "restoration of the parliamentary system with a responsible ministry." As for the general constitution, which made Hungary "an Austrian province," under "a body chiefly foreign," the Diet refused it as contrary to "the contract concluded between the nation and the reigning dynasty." It declared that it would never "sacrifice the constitutional independence of the nation for any sort of consideration or interests" (July, 1861); that it "could not make the Hungarian government dependent upon any other than the King of Hungary"; that it would not join in any general representation of the monarchy, and consented only to negotiate each question with the peoples of the hereditary states as one independent nation with other independent nations.

Neither of the two sides wished to negotiate until it should have secured from the other the formal recognition of its right: the Hungarians their historic constitution, the Emperor his granted constitution; the two rights being mutually contradictory, the negotiation ended in an official rupture. The government returned to its policy of repression as a *provisional* system, to wear out the patience of the Hungarians. But the Hungarians did not yield, and the system remained in force until 1866. The Croats also refused to join the *Reichsrath*, as long as the government refused them union with Dalmatia.

The less strongly organized nations, Poles and Czechs, who had begun by joining in the *Reichsrath*, gradually changed their policy. It seemed to them more advantageous to imitate the

Hungarians. The Poles withdrew from the *Reichsrath*; the Czechs, after winning the majority in the Bohemian *Landtag*, refused to send their delegates. There remained in the *Reichsrath* only Germans and representatives of the little nations.

Meanwhile the ministry disagreed even with the German party in the *Reichsrath*, principally on its financial policy; the deficit continued, the debt increased, and the ministry was obliged to confess that it had concealed the deficit by cooking of the accounts. The German liberal party reproached the ministry with having reduced the constitutional system to a fiscal process, to obtain money. The Chamber demanded first a balanced budget (1864), then a reduction in expenses (1865), and finally refused to sanction a loan.

Suspension of the Constitution.—The Emperor had accepted the Constitution of 1861 in order to maintain unity between his states and to aid his government to perform its offices. The system worked badly in one part of the monarchy; in the other the population refused it, and it was impossible even to convoke an assembly of representatives of the empire. The *Reichsrath*, so far from aiding the ministers, hindered them by demanding accounts. The Emperor, disgusted with this failure, returned to the Austrian tradition of *dualism*. Finding in Hungary a distinct nation too independent to enter a centralized monarchy, the Emperor resigned himself to its separation from the rest of the monarchy, that he might have it for an ally.

Then began negotiations with the Hungarians to reconcile their *historic rights* with imperial unity. In order to avoid being interfered with during these negotiations, the Emperor got rid of the *Reichsrath*, the German liberal ministry (July 27), and finally the constitution. He declared (September 20) that, "having decided to come to an understanding with the legal representatives of his peoples in the eastern regions," he found it "necessary to suspend (*sistiren*) the constitution." The *suspension* was announced as provisional. But the new ministry (Belcredi) was composed of nobles of the aristocratic party. So the suspension was denounced as a *coup d'état* by German liberals and was received with joy by the federalists in Poland and Bohemia, and the Catholic party in the Tyrol. The Hungarian and Croatian Diets were convoked to discuss the conditions of the agreement; the Empire recognised the laws of '48 *in principle*, on condition that the Diet should revise them in accordance with the requirements of unity. The negotiations began in December, 1865, but

were interrupted by the war of 1866, and were not completed until 1867.

It became necessary to choose between two systems: dualism, which would divide the Empire between two nations only (the crown of St. Stephen for the Magyars, the imperial crown for the Germans); and federalism, which would break it up into an indefinite number of states. The ministry promptly decided in favour of the federalists, and convoked a special Reichsrath, where the majority was federalist. But the members from the German countries refused to take their seats, so the Reichsrath found itself no longer large enough to discuss the compromise to be concluded with Hungary.

It was the former prime minister of Saxony, von Bismarck, who, having entered the service of Austria after the war of 1866, induced the Emperor to renounce federalism. The Bismarck ministry (February, 1867) put an end to the *suspension* by establishing dualism and the constitutional system.

The Hungarian Compromise.—The compromise (*Ausgleich*) of 1867 was the first work of the new government. It cut the Empire into two states, strictly equal in rights, both subject to the same sovereign, though under two different titles, *Emperor* of Austria and *apostolic King* of Hungary, with the same flag (the imperial eagle). The monarchy officially adopted the double title of Austria-Hungary. The division was made according to historic traditions: the state of Hungary was composed of the countries under the crown of St. Stephen (Hungary, Croatia, Slavonia, Transylvania, Servia, and the military frontier), the state of Austria including all the rest (17 provinces). The two groups were designated by names already in use, *Cisleithania* (Austria) and *Transleithania* (Hungary). These were exact geographical terms when applied to the *province* of Austria and the *kingdom* of Hungary, which were separated by the Leitha river, but have become purely conventional by extension to all the countries joined to Austria, of which several (Galicia, Bukovina) are east of the Leitha. Each of the two states comprised a ruling race, which gave the government its national character, German in Cisleithania, Magyar in Transleithania, and several small peoples, mainly Slavs, less strongly organized and less civilized. Bismarck is said to have remarked to the Hungarian ministry: "Take care of your barbarians, we will take care of ours."

The two states were joined, not by a simply personal union,

as in 1848, but by a common government directing common affairs. These affairs were of two sorts:

1. Affairs common to the two halves of the Empire were reduced to three classes: foreign affairs, army and navy (except the fixing of the number of troops and the regulation of military service), and finances connected with the common expenses. These subjects were assigned to three imperial ministers, in theory responsible at once to the parliaments of both states.

2. Affairs to be settled on common principles by agreements made from time to time (commerce, customs tariffs, currency, military system, and factory legislation).

For the management of affairs of the first class, the compromise of 1867 establishes, side by side with the common ministry, the institution known as the *delegations*. These are two bodies of delegates from the two parliaments, 60 from each, of whom 40 are in each case chosen by the lower house and 20 by the upper house. In order to maintain the equality of the two halves, it was agreed that the delegations should meet alternately at Vienna and at Buda-Pesth. The two delegations sit separately, deliberating each in its own language, and communicating only by written messages; if they do not succeed in coming to an agreement they meet together, but simply to vote, without debate. The delegations are not a legislature; their chief function is to control the expenditure for the common purposes, and to exert a parliamentary influence over the common ministry. They have no power of taxation: the money needed for covering such expenditures as they approve is raised, under apportionment, by the two halves of the monarchy.

Affairs of the second class—those regulated according to identical principles—do not come within the field of the delegations. They are settled by agreements or contracts, negotiated from time to time between the two ministries (Austrian and Hungarian) and later carried through the two parliaments in substantially identical form.

The first contract established a system of common customs tariff, a bank, a common system of currency (with two different issues), and weights and measures. It divided the previous debt and expenses for the future; Hungary took only 30 per cent.

This system was an unprecedented creation, which the theorists were at a loss to define. It was not a federal state like North Germany. There were no permanent regulations for economic interests; the economic matters in common between the two

states, determined by temporary agreements of short date, were to be brought up for settlement periodically; either of the two parliaments could break the tariff union, destroy the bank, unity in economic legislation, and even unity of weights and measures. Nothing was to be permanent but the diplomatic and military union, and even this is not perpetual. Union has been concluded, not between the two states, but between each of them and the reigning dynasty; if the family of Lorraine should become extinct, the union would come to an end and Hungary would become an elective kingdom.

The Liberal Constitutions of 1867.—In each of the two states the compromise was accompanied by a restoration of the constitution and elective representation.

Hungary received the Constitution of 1848 again, revised by the King's request, so that he should have the right of choosing all the ministers. It was a very liberal constitution, similar to the Belgian. The King swore to uphold it. It guaranteed all personal and political liberties. It gave the executive power to a responsible ministry, the legislative power to a Diet composed of two Chambers. The Chamber of Magnates remained aristocratic, composed chiefly of hereditary nobles (more than 800 members). The Chamber of Deputies, which became in fact the principal assembly, was composed of deputies elected by public vote, under a very extended suffrage—with a low property qualification and very wide rights of voting based on education and occupation. Ability to speak Magyar is required.

In Austria the Constitution of 1861, modified by the "fundamental laws" of 1867, became also a liberal and parliamentary constitution. The law "on the general *rights* of citizens" proclaimed equality, according to the revolutionary formula: "All citizens are equal before the law; public employments are equally open to all." It recognised personal and political liberties according to liberal forms, and to reassure the non-German peoples, it proclaimed equality of language and race.*

The *Reichsrath* retained its organization, with a House of

* "All races in the state enjoy equal rights, and each has an inviolable right to its own nationality and tongue. The equal rights (*Gleichberechtigung*) of all the languages in use is recognised by the state in school, office, and public life. In countries peopled by a number of races, public educational institutions must be so organized that, without resorting to constraint to compel the learning of another language, each of these races shall receive the necessary privileges of instruction in their own tongue."

Lords and a House of Representatives (203) elected by the Diets of the 17 provinces.* The ministry was declared *responsible* to the *Reichsrath*, and the right of initiative was granted to that body.

The power was divided between the central *Reichsrath* and the local Diets, so that the *Reichsrath* should receive all that was deemed necessary to the maintenance of unity, not simply the powers conferred on the German *Reichstag* (common budget, military service, commerce, weights and measures, credit, transportation, public health, naturalization), but even the regulation of the freedom of the press, public meetings, association, "confessional relations," "educational *principles*," criminal justice, civil and commercial rights, and organization of courts and administration. To the Diets were intrusted "all other objects of legislation not expressly reserved to the *Reichsrath*." The constitution could be changed only by a two-thirds majority in the *Reichsrath*.

Austria became a liberal constitutional monarchy, almost parliamentary, with a representative system in three stages: in each of the 17 provinces a Diet (*Landtag*) voting the laws and the budget of the province; for Austria the *Reichsrath*; for the whole Austro-Hungarian monarchy the *Delegations*.

AUSTRIA-HUNGARY.

Since 1867 Austria and Hungary have been two distinct states: each has its own domestic policy. But the common sovereign and foreign policy maintain between them a joint responsibility which affects even their domestic policy. I shall, therefore, give a parallel presentation of their history, divided into two periods by an historical incident, the occupation of Bosnia (1878), which, though outside of the monarchy, has modified the internal evolution of both states.

Conditions of Political Life in Austria.—Cisleithania was still a very heterogenous mixture of peoples. Political life, after 1867, continued to be subject to strife between races; parties were essentially national; they were grouped into Centralists, who advocated the common government under German officials, and Federalists, who advocated local governments under Slavs

* Bohemia 54, Moravia 22, Silesia 6, Galicia 38, Bukovina 5, Dalmatia 5, Lower Austria 18, Upper Austria 10, Salzburg 3, Styria 13, Carinthia 5, Carniola 6, Tyrol 10, Vorarlberg 2, Istria 2, Goerz-Gradisca 2, Trieste 2.

(Czechs, Poles, Slovenians, and Croats). The Germans broke into *political* parties also: the old-*régime* and Catholic party (*conservative*), and the democratic, anti-clerical party (*liberal*).

Political life was greatly complicated by the fact that the nations no longer corresponded to the sharp distinctions of race. "Races," in Austria-Hungary, were practically distinguished only by language; a man's nationality depended on the language he usually spoke; part of the Germans are Germanized Slavs.* So in each province the nations, or peoples speaking different tongues, are not juxtaposed, but entangled and superposed. In almost all the countries where the Slavs predominated, German remained the language of the cities, the great landlords, and educated men; for it was the language of commerce, the court, science, and literature. Italian played the same part on the Adriatic coast. There were countries which were altogether German, or rather Germanized, and exempt from this national strife; but in all the others the difference in tongue created enmity between the inhabitants of the same region, often of the same city even. The struggle was therefore carried not only into the *Reichsrath*, on questions of the general policy of the monarchy, but also into the Diet of each province, on questions of the rights of each race, which in reality resolved themselves into rights of those using the same language.

The constitution, in proclaiming the principle of "equal rights" of race and tongue in "school, office, and public life," had presented the language question without settling it. In practice it was possible to have primary schools for each language (not easily, however, in the villages of mixed tongues and in the cities where the families of a special tongue lived far apart). But should secondary education be given in the local tongue according to the principle of equality? Or would it be necessary, even in the interest of the scholars, to keep German as the language of education, that they might have access to modern science? A like embarrassment hindered the application of the principle of equality to "offices and public life." The unity of the monarchy required a state language for common operations. German had always been the language of the court, the government, and the army, and, besides, the only language in which the

* It would be out of place here to consider whether European races are distinct in the ethnological sense, that is to say, varieties of men with an anthropological character, fixed and transmissible, or differ only in language and education.

other nations themselves could communicate with each other.* It was clearly necessary to leave it this privilege and to restrict the equality to local administration and the courts. But there again, how should it be established in practice? It was not enough to draw up regulations and advice in various languages; every subject must be given the right to speak to the authorities and receive their answer, to present actions, and to receive judgment in his own tongue. But how could every office-holder be expected to have a fluent knowledge of every language in the province? Mixed primary schools, secondary and higher education, and the regulation of languages in the courts and administration, have thus been the principal fields of conflict.

In these conflicts the position of parties was determined by the electoral organization. The Constitution of 1867 had preserved the system of 1861, which rested not on the abstract right of suffrage, regarded as revolutionary, but on the "representation of interests." Four classes of electors had been established according to qualifications based on economic status: great landowners, chambers of commerce, cities, and rural districts; each class voted separately and elected its own deputies; in the rural districts the vote was in two degrees. Not only was the suffrage restricted, for there was a property qualification (varying in different provinces), even for city and rural voters; but it was also very unevenly distributed, for in the classes of great landowners and chambers of commerce, where voters were few, each vote had much more weight than in the city class, and in the latter more than in the rural districts. As the majority of great landowners, merchants, and manufacturers were either German or Germanized, this inequality in representation secured the Germans a majority in almost all the diets, even in the Slavic countries (Bohemia, Moravia, Silesia), where the native population was represented only by rural districts. The German majorities in the Diets assured a German majority in the *Reichsrath*.

Political and National Parties.—The German provinces in the

* The following table, taken from the official census, gives the proportion of languages in 1869 and in 1890; the figures are given in millions:

	1869	1890		1869	1890
German,	7.1	8.5	Slovenian,	1.19	1.20
Czech,	4.7	5.5	Croatian,	0.52	0.65
Polish,	2.44	3.8	Italian,	0.58	0.67
Ruthenian,	2.58	3.0	Rouman,	0.20	0.20

central regions were divided, not into nationalist parties, but into Liberal and Catholic parties, like those of other countries. The Liberals predominated in the industrial provinces of the east, Lower Austria (where Vienna is situated), Styria, the region of the metallurgic industry, and Carinthia. The Catholic strength lay in the mountains of the west, where the peasants were still under clerical influence; they had a permanent majority in the Tyrol, and won it in Vorarlberg and Salzburg. In Upper Austria the majority depended on the great landowners, who followed the government.

The Slovenian province of Carniola became the centre of the Slovenian national party, which secured the equality of Slovenians in Carniola and claimed it for the provinces where Slovenians remained subject to the Germans (Carinthia and Styria), or to the Italians (Istria, Goerz, and Trieste).

In the southern provinces the Italians at first predominated; then little by little they gave place to the Slavic population of the country, the Slovenians in Istria, Goerz, Gradisca, and Trieste, and the Croats in Dalmatia. The defection of the great landowners lost them the Diet in Dalmatia; the Croat majority made Croatian the language of the province. In the Tyrol the regional division of races still obtained: Germans in the north, Italians in the south; the Italian minority demanded a separate administration for the Italian districts.

In the northern provinces, where the Slavs were strongest, parties divided on nationalist lines.

Bohemia was the centre of the Czech party. The Czechs controlled the country parts and occupied at least two-thirds of the kingdom; but the great landowners assured a strong majority to the German party in the Diet until the government, which had now allied itself to the Czechs, gained the election of a majority on their side (1879). In the old provinces now joined to Bohemia (Moravia and Silesia), where the great mass of the people were Czech, the Germans held their majority, thanks to the cities and landowners.

In Galicia the Polish party predominated, directed by the Catholic aristocracy, to which the mass of the Polish population was still subject. The Ruthenians had never had a political power proportionate to their numbers; they had remained a rural class, socially inferior, and even in the Ruthenian region a portion of the deputies are still Poles. The Galician Diet has always been controlled by a majority of Polish nobles; the Ruthenian

minority confined itself to asking for autonomy for its schools and church (United Greeks).

Bukovina, where the people are Roumanian, has led only a feeble political existence. At first it sent ministerial deputies to the *Reichsrath*; then the Roumanian national party finally gained possession of a majority in its Diet.

Thus, at the beginning of the constitutional system, there already existed in Austria two German political parties, liberal and conservative (which were to subdivide into groups), and seven nationalist parties (Czechs, Poles, Ruthenians, Slovenians, Italians, Croats, and Roumanians), whose policy consisted principally in trying to gain from the central government concessions for their languages and their national autonomy. These parties in the *Reichsrath* were organized in extra-parliamentary meetings called clubs. Each formed only a slight minority. So there has never been in the *Reichsrath* a homogeneous majority composed of a single party. The majority has always been a coalition between parties.

The leading question in domestic policy was the adjustment of relations with the clergy. Should the official power of the Church be maintained as it was established by the Concordat of 1855 (see p. 422), with prohibition of non-Catholic public worship and clerical control of schools? Or should the German lay system be adopted? The liberal party, composed, like the national liberal party in Germany, of the imperialist and anti-clerical middle class, demanded, first of all, ecclesiastical and educational reform. It was sub-divided into two clubs, progressive and liberal. The Conservative party demanded the maintenance of the old ecclesiastical and economic system; it was composed of two sets of opponents to the liberals, German Catholics and conservatives from the little countries (Slovenians and Croats).

National politics were occupied at once with the language question and the rights of local Diets. The Germans wished to retain German as the state language for the courts, administration, and secondary schools. The other races, in proportion to their power, demanded either simply the administration of their own schools and churches, administrative autonomy, complete equality of their language, or independence of their Diet.

In foreign affairs the German liberals favoured Germany and Italy, while the Catholics were hostile to them. Among the Slavic races, the Czechs, in their rôle of Pan Slavists, were enthusiastically friendly toward Russia and hostile toward Ger-

many; the Poles still hated Russia irreconcilably; the Slovenians, Croats, and Ruthenians had Russian sympathies.

In this intersection of political contradictions, which seemed to permit only temporary combinations, the various parties in Austria have, however, united in more lasting coalitions than in Germany. A social affinity attracted the aristocratic Polish and Czech clubs to the German conservative clubs: a common hostility united the national "historic rights" parties and the old-régimists against the new centralized and liberal constitution. There was a natural coalition between the Slavs, the aristocrats, and the Catholics.

After 1867 the Emperor governed as a constitutional sovereign, and even seemed to adopt the practices of the parliamentary system, for the ministry always had a majority in the Chamber of Deputies. But, in contradiction to the parliamentary system, the Emperor did not choose his ministers from the majority in the Chamber; following out his personal policy, he chose ministers who made a majority for themselves in the Chamber. The electoral system of classes created among the deputies a social division which prevented the formation of an independent government majority. In practice the deputies from the property-holding classes always followed the ministry, and their votes sufficed to give the majority to one or other of the coalitions. (In the House of Lords the ministers could directly control the balance of parties by appointing new life members.) Thus the majority depended on the landowners, the landowners on the ministry, and the ministry on the Emperor. The Emperor could, therefore, choose with which party he would carry on the government. But between the two coalitions he has never been able to make a definite choice. As a German, and in the interests of his empire, he leans toward the German Centralist coalition; as an aristocrat and Catholic, he personally prefers the aristocratic federalist coalition. His oscillations between the two have been the controlling factor in the political history of Austria.

The Liberal Ministry (1867-70).—The Emperor began by giving the ministry and the majority to the German liberal party, which accepted the new Constitution of 1867 without reservation. The Auersperg ministry was principally occupied with the ecclesiastical struggle. The official authority of the Catholic clergy, which the Concordat of 1855 had formally recognised, found itself in irrevocable contradiction with the Constitution of 1867, which guaranteed complete religious liberty. The minis-

try, without repudiating the Concordat, passed laws which practically abrogated it. 1. Jurisdiction of marriage affairs was restored to the lay courts and a civil form of marriage was created for cases where the Church refused to perform the ceremony. 2. The law on the relations between school and Church established the principle that: "The superior direction and supervision of education belong to the state and are exercised by the organs which it creates for the purpose." In consequence, all public schools were opened "to all citizens without regard to creed," and educational offices were declared "equally accessible to all citizens"; churches and religious societies of all creeds received the right to maintain private schools. 3. The law on "interconfessional relations" established religious equality and recognised the right of every subject to choose his religion and that of his children, to be buried in the public cemetery, and to enjoy unrestrained freedom in religious exercises.

These laws, which were carried with difficulty through the House of Lords (1868), put an immediate stop to the compulsive authority of the clergy; they established freedom of religion and made education independent of the Church. This was the chief ground of opposition. The concordat had been a treaty between the Emperor and the Pope: the Catholic party declared that it could be abrogated only by a new treaty with the Pope. The government, on the contrary, claimed, in the name of the sovereignty of the state, the sovereign power of regulating internal affairs. A theoretical conflict ensued between the two authorities, state and Church. The Pope, in an address (June, 1868), called the Constitution of 1867 "really deplorable" (*infandissima*) and the laws of 1868 "abominable." "By virtue of the apostolic authority," he "rejected and condemned these laws," declaring them "void for the present and the future." In consequence of this a number of bishops refused to issue papers in matrimonial causes; the Archbishop of Linz, who resisted with force, was tried and condemned, in 1869, but afterward pardoned.

The ministry had to reorganize the army and the financial system. It adopted the Prussian system of a universal military service of three years, but with a *garde mobile*, on the French plan. The contingent was divided into two parts, one doing effective service (three years in the active army, seven in the reserve, two in the *Landwehr*), the other remaining twelve years in the *Landwehr*. By making it a Cabinet question, the ministry secured the exemption of the number of the effective forces from

annual discussion, as in Germany; the figure was fixed for ten years. In financial affairs, the ministry renounced the system of chronic deficit and loans: it re-established the balance by taxes and a partial bankruptcy under form of a tax on the interest of government bonds. The ministry was always supported in the Chamber of the *Reichsrath* by a majority composed of German liberals and great landowners. But the Slavic national parties offered a vigorous resistance which finally defeated the ministry.

The Czech party refused to sit in the Bohemian Diet. In the *declaration* of August, 1868, the Czech nation set forth its theory and claims: between the Emperor, its hereditary King, and the "political nation of Bohemia" exists a contract renewed at each succession by the King's coronation oath and the representatives' oath of homage. The Kingdom of Bohemia is joined to Austria only by a dynastic union (which would expire with the dynasty); it preserves its "historic and rightful individuality." This constitutional relation cannot be changed legally except "by a new contract between the King of Bohemia and the lawful representatives of the people." No outside representative body, not even the *Reichsrath*, has the right to impose a debt or taxes on Bohemia. The Hungarian compromise has robbed the Constitution of 1860-61 of all value. Bohemia could no longer recognise the *Reichsrath*, which now represented only "a chance group without historical foundation." The constitutional contest cannot be settled except by an agreement between the King and the people.

The Czechs took toward the Emperor exactly the same attitude that the Hungarians had taken previous to 1867. They, too, claimed the position of an independent nation in the name of "historic right" and "personal union." They too demanded the reconstitution of the Middle-Age kingdom by the reunion of the three "countries under the crown of Wenceslaus" (Bohemia, Moravia, Silesia). It was the same historic theory, the same tactics: to recognise the Emperor by the title of *King* only, and to refuse to enter into relations with the other countries of the Empire. But the actual situation was not the same. The Magyars had always been self-governing; the absolutist system attempted after 1849 had been too short-lived to disorganize them; they had found themselves still intact, with their aristocracy still national, and had unanimously decided to repulse any form of foreign government. The Czechs had had their reaction in 1620, and their centralization had already endured two and a half

centuries; half of the aristocracy and a third of the population were foreigners, accustomed to treat Czechs as inferiors and ready to defend the government of Vienna. In Moravia and Silesia the foreign element controlled the country. The Germans answered the Czech declaration with the theory that Bohemia had no special historic right and consequently no other law than the constitution granted by the Emperor.

The Polish party set forth its theory in the *resolution* passed by the Polish majority in the Galician Diet. Not being able, like the Magyars and Czechs, to invoke the right of forming an independent state, it confined itself to demanding "national autonomy." It reproached the Constitution of 1867 with "not granting the amount of legislative and administrative independence" to which the country was entitled. It therefore demanded that "the Galician delegation should not take part in the deliberations of the *Reichsrath* except in the case of matters common to this kingdom and the other countries." It wished to reserve for the Diet legislation on matters of commerce, credit, education, public health, penal law, judicial and administrative organization.

Attempt at a Federalist Constitution (1870-71).—The opposition, adopting the policy of abstinence which had brought success to the Magyars, refused to sit in the *Reichsrath*. The constitution gave the government an easy means of action against a Diet which should refuse *en masse* to choose delegates to the *Reichsrath*; this was the right to have delegates directly elected by the voters who chose the members of the Diet. But against the delegates of a Diet who *individually* refused to take their seats in the *Reichsrath* the government was powerless. Meanwhile, in Vienna, the workingmen, organized by German socialists, came before the Chamber with a great demonstration and presented a petition for universal suffrage, freedom of public meeting, association, and the press (December, 1869).*

The Emperor began by dismissing the aristocratic minority of the ministry (December, 1869). But all the opposition parties withdrew from the *Reichsrath*, the Tyrolean Catholics, the Galicians, Slovenians, Italians from Trieste and Istria, and the Roumans from Bukovina; there remained hardly any but Germans, who just made up a quorum. The centralist ministers demanded the dissolution of the local Diets. The Emperor refused.

* The military law brought on an insurrection of Slav mountaineers in southern Dalmatia; the government subdued it only by renouncing the introduction of the Landwehr into this region (1869-70).

He changed his system and determined to make terms with the Slavic nationalist aristocracy, as he had done in 1865 with the Magyar aristocracy. Meanwhile he took a transitional ministry (April, 1870) under a Pole, Potocki.

The uncertainty caused by the Franco-Prussian war put a temporary check upon the Emperor's plans. But the war over, he called a federalist ministry with an aristocratic chief (Hohenwart) and two Czech members (February, 1871). The parties were of two groups: *constitutionalist* (*Verfassungstreue*), which wanted to preserve the centralist constitution of 1861; *federalist*, which demanded an increase of power for the local Diets. The federalist ministry had the Diets dissolved that had a German constitutionalist majority; and the landowners, who always supported the ministry, turned the balance in favour of the federalists.

The Czechs joined the coalition only on the condition of independence for Bohemia. Their chiefs negotiated personally with the Emperor, who announced the outcome in a message (September 12, 1871). He declared himself "willing to recognise the rights of this kingdom," and ready to renew the coronation oath. The Bohemian Diet replied with 28 fundamental articles establishing for Bohemia the same system of union as that of Hungary.

A violent agitation arose all through the German states: the Diets protested, the newspapers threatened, the people held mass-meetings. The Emperor, however, was most influenced by the fact that Chancellor Beust and the Hungarian ministers, disturbed by the Czech Pan Slavism, joined hands against the federalists. A council which was held between the leading ministers (October, 1871) determined the Emperor to return to the Constitution of 1867. The Hohenwart ministry withdrew. Then Beust, its principal opponent, suddenly fell into disgrace and was replaced in the foreign affairs of Austria-Hungary by a Hungarian, Andrássy. (The title of Chancellor was suppressed.)

Electoral Reform and Constitutionalist Ministries (1871-78).—In returning to the constitution, the Emperor took a German ministry again (Auersperg); a new dissolution of the Diets restored the majority to the German constitutionalist party in the *Reichsrath*. In turn the Czechs, Slavs, and Catholics refused to sit in it. But the ministry had won over the Poles and the Dalmatian Croats. It now renewed the project of election by direct vote.

Although electoral reform had been accepted in principle, it was not accomplished for more than a year. All were agreed that the number of deputies should be increased; but the liberals proposed to distribute the additional seats among the least represented classes; the ministry was unwilling to sacrifice the privileges of the propertied classes, whose support it would need in making up the two-thirds necessary to a change of constitution.

The electoral law of 1873 passed the Chamber of Deputies by a vote of 120 against 2. For election of the deputies by the local Diets it substituted election by the voters. But it applied to these elections the system of classes used in the election of members of the local Diets.*

The number of deputies was increased to 353: 85 to land-owners, 137 to cities and chambers of commerce, 131 to rural districts (these by indirect election). There was still an enormous inequality of representation (in 1890, 1 deputy to 63 electors in the property holders' *curia*, 1 to 27 in the chambers of commerce, 1 to 2918 in the cities, 1 to 11,600 in the rural districts). The Germans still held the majority. (Up to 1878 there were in the Chamber of Deputies about 220 Germans, against 115 Slavs and 15 Italians.)

*The following table gives the distribution of seats among the classes and provinces:

	Rural Districts.	Cities.	Chambers or Commerce.	Great Landowners.
Bohemia,	30	32	7	23
Moravia,	11	13	3	9
Galicia,	27	13	3	20
Lower Austria,	10	17	2	8
Upper Austria,	7	6	1	3
Styria,	9	8	2	4
Carinthia,	4	3	1	1
Bukovina,	3	2	1	3

	Rural Districts.	Cities and Chambers of Commerce.	Great Landowners.
Dalmatia,	6	2	1
Istria,	2	1	1
Goerz,	2	1	1
Carniola,	5	3	2
Salzburg,	2	2	1
Tyrol,	8	5	5
Vorarlberg,	2	1	0
Silesia,	3	4	3

Trieste: 4 (elected by 3 electoral bodies and 1 chamber of commerce).

The ministry, supported by the German Constitutionalist majority, resumed its anti-clerical policy. The "May Laws" (1874), so called in imitation of the German laws of the *Culturkampf*, formally abolished the system of the concordat. They obliged the bishops to report to civil authority all vacancies in Church offices and all nominations, and recognised the right of non-Catholics to found religious societies. The Pope protested; he wrote to the Emperor, who replied by entrenching himself behind the rights of the *Reichsrath*.

There was under this ministry a fever of stock-jobbing like that of the "promoters" in Berlin (p. 496). The fictitious values created by the banking societies, railroad and building corporations suddenly fell in the famous Vienna crash (May 9, 1873), a gigantic collapse of the stock-exchange, which was followed by a long business depression.

In the *Reichsrath* the Constitutionalist party had organized into distinct clubs, which were, however, united to support the ministry: the United Left, nicknamed "the Young Ones" (about 65 deputies), divided into *democrats* and *German nationalists*,—the Liberal Club (about 100), nicknamed "the Old Ones,"—the Centralist Right (about 60), a group of great landowners who made up the Coronini club, mainly Italians. The opposition consisted of the Polish club (between 40 and 45),—the Catholics, who were not yet organized,—the Hohenwart club (*Rechtspartei*), composed of federalists belonging to the small countries. The Czechs (more than 40) refused to attend the *Reichsrath* after the rupture of 1871.

Parties and Politics in Hungary (1867-78).—A period of political calm followed the compromise of 1867 in the Kingdom of Hungary. As in Austria, the compromise had given the government to the politically dominant race, though not the greatest numerically. Of a population of 16,000,000 souls, the Magyars numbered at that time hardly more than 6,000,000. But their relative force was much greater than that of the Austrian Germans. They constituted a compact nation with a patriotic aristocracy accustomed to ruling, very much in favour with the Emperor, and an inert and docile rural population. The commercial bourgeoisie, composed mainly of Germans and Jews, had no political force whatever. The other races were mainly composed of masses of peasants having no political interest, and, besides, cut off in the extremities of the kingdom,—the Slovacs in the northwest, the Roumans in the east (in Transylvania), and the

Serbs in the southeast. The German colonies scattered over the Hungarian plains, the Germans and Jews established individually in the cities, were absolutely without cohesion or national organization, and did not form a party. Two groups alone had a national organization: the kingdom of Croatia-Slavonia in the southeast, and the little group of Saxons in Transylvania (200,000 souls), a German colony which retained its German character, but whose growth in population was slight.

The government had at first but little to do with the Slovak peasants, who either did not vote at all or else voted for the Magyar nobles. The Serbs had their orthodox patriarch, their churches and their schools, and especially clung to their religious autonomy. Transylvania, where the government had opposed the Saxons to the Magyars by organizing an independent Diet (1849 and 1863), was incorporated into the Kingdom of Hungary. It lost its Diet and its independent administration, and was divided into 75 districts directly represented in the Hungarian Diet. The Saxons joined the Magyars through fear of the orthodox Rouman peasants, who formed the base of the population: the electoral system of property qualification gave almost all the rural seats to the two aristocracies.

The Croats alone, who had in old times a constitution and were represented by an aristocracy, had been able to preserve their autonomy by taking advantage of the rivalry between Austria and Hungary. The *compromise* concluded between the Hungarian and Croatian Diets (1868) left to the united kingdom of Croatia-Slavonia its governor (*Ban*), its capital Agram, and its Diet composed of 75 members elected by property holders and 48 members by right (magnates and dignitaries). It was a self-governed state, with a national coat of arms, an official national language (Croatian), a system of justice, education, religion, and a legislative power exercised by the Diet. But it remained united to Hungary by very extensive "common affairs," which included, in addition to the affairs common to the two states of Hungary and Austria, all questions of commerce and of communication. In these matters, Croatia was represented in the government by a Croatian minister, in the Hungarian Diet by 40 delegates from the Diet at Agram, in the Imperial Delegation by 5 delegates. A financial agreement, made for ten years, divided the income from Croatian taxes between the two countries, granting 45 per cent. for Croatia's particular expenses, but fixing a minimum which Hungary must complete in case of a deficit.

The Hungarian government at Pesth appointed the *Ban*; it also imposed in 1868 an electoral system so arranged as to give the majority to the advocates of the compromise.

In the two Hungarian Chambers the secondary peoples had thus only insignificant minorities. The Diet was composed almost entirely of Magyars, and party division was based only on questions of policy. The situation was almost the same as in 1848. The *Right* or *moderate opposition*, the conservative party, especially numerous in the Chamber of Magnates, was still in favour at the court of Vienna; its aim was to maintain the aristocratic and Catholic *régime* as firmly as possible. The "address party," organized as the "Déák Club," had accepted the compromise of 1867 and the agreement with Austria; it wished to establish in Hungary a liberal parliamentary system, at the same time preserving the administration by the nobility. The *Left*, formerly the upholders of the Constitution of '48, were hostile to Austria, demanded a personal union, and protested against the compromise of 1867 as contrary to national independence. The *extreme Left* was composed of democrats, followers of Kossuth, and exiles of 1848, irreconcilable enemies to Austria. (Kossuth, who had retired to Italy, refused to the day of his death, in 1894, to return to his native land or to recognise Francis Joseph.)

The government was always strictly parliamentary, the King choosing only those ministers who had the support of the majority in the House. But in Hungary, as in Italy, the ministry had until now always controlled the elections.

The Déák party had at first a strong majority and became the liberal ministerial party. The liberal ministry concluded the arrangements with Austria and had the laws of 1848 revised. It then began the reorganization of the army, the administration, and the financial system. The active army remained common to all the states of the Empire, and retained German as the language of command. But the *Honveds*, corresponding to the *Landwehr*, became an exclusively Hungarian army. The counties remained self-governing, directed by a committee formed half of elected delegates, half of the heaviest taxpayers; none dared to make a complete reform, for fear of irritating the nobility. The liberal party had also in its program the separation of the state from Church authority (full religious liberty, civil marriage, abolition of compulsory confession of faith). The discussion of these reforms was, however, long delayed, for fear of driving the Catholic party into a coalition with the Left.

The principal matter was to secure national unity in the country by Magyarizing it. The government, with the aid of all parties, struggled to give Magyar the place occupied by German in Cisleithania—the language of the state and of civilization; it made it the language not only of the government and the University, but of the administration, courts, fiscal offices, and secondary public education. It was next introduced into the municipal council of Buda-Pesth (1872)* and in the railroads, where it had to be taught to employees. The scattered Germans became quickly Magyarized, and soon they even adopted Magyar names.†

The financial reorganization was so laborious that it produced a crisis in the parties. The deficit increased, credit diminished, and the ministerial party was weakened little by little. At the elections of 1869 it had lost 50 votes; after 1872 it sought to win over the Right. The main branch of the Left (*Left Centre*), under Tisza's direction, renounced the policy of a personal union and joined the Déák party (1875) in trying to restore financial order. The liberals, thus re-enforced, had 329 seats against 88 opponents. They have always held their majority and governed Hungary without interruption. After the election of August, 1875, Tisza took the ministry and held it for over fifteen years.

In Croatia the *unionist* party, which had made the compromise of 1868, was accused of having sold itself to the Magyars, and of monopolizing all the official positions. The *nationalist* party won the majority in the Diet at Agram in 1872, and compelled the Hungarian government to appoint the President of the Diet as *Ban*.

Crisis of the Occupation of Bosnia (1878).—The compromise arranged between Austria and Hungary for ten years was renewed after two and a half years of laborious negotiations between the two governments. The two ministries secured its adoption only by agreeing to make it a question of confidence in the two parliaments.

* The new commune of Buda-Pesth, established as the capital of Hungary, was formed by the union of Pesth with the old German city of Ofen (Buda), on the other side of the Danube, and a number of suburbs.

† It is said that Mommsen, on his arrival at Pesth, declared that he had seen on his journey three persons of true Magyar type: Erdy, Matrai, Toldy; he was told that the real names of his three Magyars were Lutzenbacher, Rothcrebs, and Schaedel.—The famous artist Munkacsy was of German parentage.

The crisis in foreign affairs completed the rupture between the Emperor and the constitutionalist party. By the decisions of the Congress of Berlin, Austria undertook the administration of Bosnia and Herzegovina in the name of the Sultan, with the object of restoring them to order. The Austrian army took possession of the territory without a battle. But immediately the Mussulmans in the mountains revolted; a war was inevitable and an army of 200,000 men was needed to carry it on. The expedition was a costly one, and even after peace was made the country proved too poor to share the expense. Occupation involved further increase in expenditure. In addition, it complicated the inter-racial strife. The provinces which were occupied had a population speaking the Croatian language, but divided among three religions: Mussulman, Orthodox, and Catholic. The Croatian nationalist party adopted the idea of a Greater Croatia which should unite all races speaking the Croatian tongue (Croatia, Dalmatia, Slavonia, and Bosnia). This Slavic agitation was equally disquieting to both Hungary and Austria.

In both states the parliaments were displeased with the ministries for undertaking the occupation of Bosnia, and the additional expenditure it involved, without consulting them; they asserted that the treaty of Berlin ought to be laid before them for discussion. In both states the ministers, instead of resigning, asked the confidence of the House. In Hungary the address favourable to the government, in spite of the enormous ministerial majority, was carried by a majority of only 22. In Austria it was passed only through the support of the Poles and the Right, usually in opposition (1878).

The *Delegations* reduced the extra appropriations demanded for the Bosnia expedition (1878). The wrangling continued on the occupation question. The left wished to evacuate Bosnia, the government wished to organize a system of definite occupation—until the country occupied should be able to reimburse Austria for the expenses of occupation. Several attempts were still made to patch up the Constitutionalist ministry; then a provisional ministry was once more resorted to (February, 1879).

The Emperor, who placed his foreign policy before everything else, now made a new departure. He deserted the Constitutionalist party and returned to the aristocratic-federalist coalition. This necessitated a negotiation with the Czechs. This time these did not ask for the independence of the Kingdom of Bohemia. They consented to take seats in the *Reichsrath*, only

asserting that they "reserved the question of the constitution and crown of Bohemia" (1879).

At the elections of 1879 the great landowners once more upset the balance of parties. But the majority of the federalist coalition was still very weak. The 145 constitutionalists were in two clubs, 94 liberals, 51 progressists; the 168 federalists in three clubs, 54 Czechs, 57 Poles, and 57 in the Hohenwart club (German federalists, Slovenians, Dalmatian Croats). There were, besides 40 unclassified deputies, mainly great landowners. The minister of the interior, Taaffe, announced his intention of grouping them in a third party which should hold the balance between the two opposing parties. The Emperor charged him with the formation of a ministry.

Federalist Policy of the Taaffe Ministry (1879-93).—The Taaffe ministry, which was to last fourteen years, presented itself at first as a ministry of conciliation, formed of members of both parties. In reality, from its beginning it favoured the aristocratic federalist-Catholic coalition, and after 1880 its members were all federalists.

The German left opposed the ministry on its military law. They were no longer willing to vote it except for three years, and with a reduction of effective force; the ministry insisted that it should be passed for 10 years and with the same effective force. As this would require a two-thirds majority, the law, after having been twice defeated, was passed through the defection of a half of the liberal club (December, 1879). The federalist coalition, now become the ministerial party, accepted the constitution of 1867, using their support of the government to gain concessions in favour of the Slavic peoples and the Catholic clergy. By slow but constant effort the nationalist aristocracies and the clergy increased their influence at the expense of the German officials and the lay power.

The two Czech parties, Old and Young Czechs, united against the Germans. They secured the division of the University of Prague into two universities, one German, the other Czech (1882), and later an ordinance from the minister of justice, Prazak (1886), obliging office-holders to answer the public in whichever of the two languages, Czech or German, the demand was presented. This was a means of shutting out German officers who were not familiar with Czech. Bohemia continued to be the most agitated province in the whole Empire, torn by Czech demonstrations, scuffles between Czech and German students at

Prague, struggles in the Diet, where the Czechs had finally (1883) gained the majority, and quarrels over the schools. The Germans, feeling themselves overpowered, asked first that Bohemia should be separated into two racial groups, each with its own language; then, adopting the tactics formerly pursued by the Czechs, they refused to sit in the Diet.

The Polish aristocratic party had already gained the upper hand in Galicia, where since 1877 it had reduced the Ruthenians to an insignificant minority in the Diet (10 in 150). The government abandoned Galicia to its management, confining itself to preventing official demonstrations against Russia, which would have interfered with its foreign policy.

The Slovenian party, having regained its majority in the Diet of Carniola (which it had lost from 1877 to 1883), completed the Slavizing of that province.

The conservatives secured the abolition of industrial liberty. The law of 1883 restored compulsory corporations for a part of the industrial and commercial professions; no one could be admitted to them except after examination, with a certificate of capacity. They carried an electoral reform lowering the property qualification in the inferior electoral classes, granting suffrage to "5-florin men," who as a rule favoured the Catholic party (1882).

In the face of this coalition, rendered irresistible by its alliance with the Emperor, the German liberals were uncertain as to the policy they should pursue. At first they were divided. The progressist club, displeased at having been deserted in the fight against the military law, broke away from the liberal coalition (1879). They then came together in a "United Left" (1881), which took a German national character with the motto "unity of all Germans in Austria." Next this left broke in two, the *German Club* and the *Austro-German Club* (1885). Finally a part of the German club detached itself from the rest, as the "union of German *Nationalists*" who refused to desert the anti-Semites. At each election to the *Reichsrath* the Left suffered a loss. It lost its majority in the Delegation (1882). In 1885 it had fallen to 132 members; in 1891 to 110. The House of Lords, where the German party predominated, delayed the vote on the school law; but the ministry, by appointing new peers, finally gained a majority.

Outside of the *Reichsrath* the Socialist party was for a long time paralyzed by the depression following the financial crash,

then by the struggle between the socialists and anarchists. The anarchists, who were mainly Slavs, attempted the policy of terrorism by means of riots (1882-83). The government met them with martial law and special measures (1884-85).

The federalist coalition of the Taaffe ministry was dislocated by the democratic evolution of the Czech people. The democratic party of Young Czechs, formed in 1867, had always supported a political platform opposed to that of the Old Czechs: universal suffrage, liberty of the press and of public meetings, and lay schools. But it had consented to work against the Germans in harmony with the aristocratic party of Old Czechs. In 1887 it broke up violently on the national question. Gregr, the leader of the Young Czechs, reproached Rieger, the orator of the Old Czechs, with having said: "We must gather up the crumbs of our rights from under the table" (speaking of joining the ministry and Emperor). The Old Czechs, in accepting the Constitution of 1867 and the Triple Alliance, had sacrificed their former national platform: independence of the Bohemian crown, alliance with Russia, and hostility to Germany. The Young Czechs, taking up this program together with their democratic demands, entered upon an ardent campaign of protestations, mass-meetings, demonstrations in favour of France and Russia,* which in a few years gained them the majority in the cities and rural districts of Bohemia. The Old Czechs became alarmed, and persuaded the Germans in Bohemia to resume their seats in the diet. A compact was agreed upon (1890), but a number of the Old Czechs, the "realists," were frightened by the national agitation of the Young Czechs and dared not vote for it. In the *Reichsrath* elected in 1891 the Young Czech party had 36 deputies (against 12 for the Old Czech party). They produced a doubly revolutionary platform: in national affairs, an inde-

* 1887: manifestations by students for Gregr against Rieger; a meeting of 20,000 persons, where Gregr spoke against the feudal clerical alliance, passed a resolution declaring that the Czech people did not wish to become a nation of two tongues, that it wished the Czech language to predominate, and refused to renounce the rights of the Bohemian state.—1888: scene in the Diet (January). Popular meeting, program: Czech State with Czech as the state language, coronation of the King in Bohemia.—1889: the reading club at Prague sent delegates to Paris; address before the Students' Association: "We adore France." The Young Czechs demanded that the name of John Huss should be inscribed upon the museum at Prague; the Old Czechs refused the idea as an insult to the Catholic Church.—1892: delegation to the Nancy festival.

pendent Bohemia for Czechs alone, complete equality between Prague and Vienna, decentralization of railroads; in political affairs, universal suffrage, equality of labouring classes, diminution of the army. It supported this platform with violent speeches and fiery scenes in the *Reichsrath*, where it introduced its methods of popular national agitation.*

Meanwhile a democratic movement was beginning in the German cities and industrial regions. The "social democratic industrial party," built after the German model (1888), became strong enough to organize great demonstrations, May Day festivals in favour of an eight-hour day (1890-92), and petitions for universal suffrage. In Vienna, where the population, more and more heterogeneous, was composed of Germans, Jewish merchants, and Czech labourers, an anti-Semite party was founded; it was a coalition of revolutionists and Catholics, which finally won the municipal council of Vienna and the Diet of Lower Austria. The anti-Semite movement was also manifested by declarations to the Chamber and in newspapers and street riots.

German-Polish Coalition and Electoral Reform of 1896.—The Emperor became alarmed by the growth of these revolutionary parties, threatening, as they did, both his domestic policy by democratic claims and his foreign policy by assailing the German alliance. The Taaffe ministry wavered, negotiated first with the German Left (1892), then with the Czechs (1893), then placed Prague under martial law, suspending trial by jury and liberty of the press, and finally brought forward a scheme of radical electoral reform. In the two classes of the cities and rural communes (which elected 268 out of 353 deputies) it proposed to extend the right of voting to all who should prove a six-months' domicile and ability to read and write; this would have increased the number of voters from 1,500,000 to 4,500,000.

The Conservative and German parties combined against this project. The Emperor came to an understanding with them, and formed the Windischgrätz ministry (November, 1893), supported by the most heterogeneous coalition that had yet been seen in Austria: the German parties (Left, Liberals, and Catho-

* 1891: Gregor compared Bohemia to a lemon squeezed by Austria; the Czechs feel themselves in the captivity of Babylon; the whole Slavic nation is crushed by Austrian centralization as if in the arms of a vampire.—1892 (November 18): Speech by Masaryk against Germanization; Mayer replied that the Germans consider it an act of high treason to speak of the State of Bohemia; his voice was lost in the clamour of Czech and Slovenian deputies.

lics), the Hohenwart Club, and the Polish Club opposing the Young Czechs, friends of Russia. In order to quiet the agitation in favour of electoral reform, the ministry proposed to create a new group of 43 members elected by universal suffrage (1894). But the coalition could not agree as to the details, and it fell to pieces on the question of a public grant in aid of a Slovenian secondary school in Styria. The German Left refused to vote for the grant and deserted the coalition, whereupon the ministry resigned.

After a provisional business ministry (June, 1895), the Badeni ministry was formed, resting on a coalition of the Conservative parties, the Polish Club, the Hohenwart Club, Liberal party, and Catholic party, with a policy of conciliation on a conservative basis: to take account at once of the claims of the nationalities and of the "traditional position" and more advanced "civilization" of the German people; "to prevent the overthrow of social order and to cultivate the religious feelings and religious education of youth."

The Polish aristocratic party had broken with the Czechs, now become democrats: it left the Slavic coalition to join a coalition of anti-democratic Germans, of which it assumed the leadership. Badeni, the prime minister, and Goluchowski, the common minister of foreign affairs, are Poles. The conflict was now between the aristocratic coalition, supported by the Emperor, and the new democratic parties, the Young Czechs in Bohemia, the socialists and anti-Semites in Austria.

The government, under the pressure of public opinion, has made an electoral reform (1896) which, without changing the former classes, creates a fifth class of 72 deputies, elected by districts, by universal suffrage (direct in six large cities, indirect elsewhere).

Political Struggles in Hungary since 1878.—In Hungary the liberal ministerial party preserved a sufficiently large majority to carry on the government. It continued to Magyarize the schools, and accomplished a number of reforms without inconveniencing itself. The House of Magnates was reduced in membership (1886); the term of office for the House of Deputies was increased from three to five years (the Left's demands for extended suffrage and secret ballot were rejected). The government took possession of the railroads, and adopted the famous zone tariff (1889). The ten-year agreement with Austria was renewed without difficulty for 1888-98. The political struggles

among Magyars had reference to secondary questions only. The Left struggled against the ministry, by preventing reform in the counties (1891), and especially by organizing great demonstrations in honour of Kossuth (1890 and 1894). The right had opposed the reform of the ecclesiastical system. The ministry had finally decided (1893) to present laws for the establishment of civil marriage, religious liberty, legal equality of the Jews. These laws, passed in the House by both the left and the ministerial party, were rejected by the Magnates, who were said to have the secret support of the King. Against the civil-marriage law the clergy had organized an agitation all over the country. It was finally passed when the ministry secured the King's permission to create new magnates to make up a majority (1894). These two crises caused ministerial changes. The Kossuth agitation led to Tisza's retirement in 1890; the agitation against civil marriage, in 1894, forced Wekerle to give place to Banffy.

The struggle was more intense between the Magyars and the small nationalities.

In Croatia, especially, the National party, excited by the occupation of the new Croat-speaking provinces, Bosnia and Herzegovina, had once more taken up the scheme of a Greater Croatia, which should be independent of Hungary and joined to the monarchy by a personal union. The Agram Diet voted an address to the Emperor (1878), demanding a union of Dalmatia and Bosnia. In renewing the Hungarian compromise it demanded the annexation of the *Military Frontier* to Croatia. This province, peopled by Croatian soldiers, had been, since the abolition of its special government (1866), in a provisional condition; it was finally incorporated with Croatia and was represented in the Agram Diet. The Diet also demanded the port of Fiume (1881), but Hungary has retained her provisional governor there.

Croatia, now enlarged, kept up its stolid national opposition against the Hungarian government, interspersed with violent outbreaks. A radical party, which had been formed by the side of the nationalist ministerial party, demanded a personal union. In 1883 the Hungarian minister of finance had set up over the finance offices at Agram coats of arms bearing inscriptions in both Magyar and Croat. A mob tore them down and the Ban refused to restore them. The Hungarian government sent soldiers to put them up again, appointed another Ban, and adjourned the Diet; it then resigned itself to omitting the inscrip-

tions from the coats of arms (1883). But the patriotic agitation in Croatia had been so vigorous that in 1884 the Radical party increased from 17 to 24 deputies. The Hungarian government ordered the Agram archives to be transported to Budapesth (1885); this gave rise to violent scenes in the Diet; two Radical deputies were condemned to imprisonment. The government majority, which was striving to maintain the union with Hungary, was still strong enough to contend against the Greater-Croatia party; but the agitation was still actively carried on. During the Emperor's visit to Agram a Magyar flag was burned by the students (1895).

The other nationalities, deprived of political organization, had almost no means of action except protest. The Slovaks in the northwest tried to unite with the Czechs in Bohemia and Moravia, who were their neighbours and spoke the same language. The Magyar government and the Lutheran clergy replied by forbidding any pastor or teacher in a Slovak country to join in the Slavic propaganda (1884).

Among the Serbs in the south a little separatist party, under the direction of a secret society, the *Omladina*, has been labouring since 1872 to unite the whole Servian nation under the government of Servia. The National party, including the greater part of the nation, was content with demanding home rule. It protested against the Magyar government, demanding (1884) the right, granted to the Serbs in 1790, 1848, and 1868, of electing their Metropolitan and directing church and school matters. In Croatia, where the Serbs differ from the Croats only in religion (Orthodox) and alphabet (Slavonic), the independent "Serb party of Croatia," formed after the annexation of the "Military Frontier," claimed the equality of the Cyrillic with the Latin alphabet, and the revision of the school law (1887).

The Roumans, who were almost shut out from representation by the electoral system, had for a long time confined themselves to passive protestation. They began, in 1881, to demand a separate government for Transylvania. Finally they sent a deputation to "the Emperor" at Vienna, with a memorandum (1892). The Hungarian government had the leaders tried and imprisoned (1895). A separatist party, connected with the Irredentists of Roumania, had begun to talk of "Roumania irredenta," and to dream of separation from Hungary and union with the Kingdom of Roumania.

The Saxons have finally joined the Magyars against the Rou-

man agitation.* On the other hand, the small nationalities have tried to unite against their Magyar masters. A congress of Roumans, Slovacs, and Serbs has formed an alliance for the defence of local autonomy and the unity of the kingdom (1895).

Political Evolution of Austria-Hungary in the Nineteenth Century.—Austria was a confused mixture of races, themselves a combination of heterogeneous elements and subject to an absolutist and aristocratic monarchy. The government maintained political unity and reduced the nationalist opposition to a few demands in the Hungarian Diet, and elsewhere to simple written protests. But this system, though practicable in a bureaucratic state, was not in harmony with representative assemblies fired with racial passion; it became impossible when representative institutions were granted. The revolution of 1848 suddenly revealed the national antagonisms; it established dualism, that is to say, division of the monarchy between the two leading races, Magyars and Germans. But as both had joined the democratic parliamentary party, the monarchical government crushed them with the aid of the Slavs, who remained submissive to the Empire, and restored absolutism, completed by clerical control.

The military defeats of 1859 and 1866 and the loss of its credit made the German government decide to adopt a liberal constitutional system. It first attempted to maintain the unity of the whole Empire, then, yielding to the unanimous resistance of the Magyars, it took the bold course of abandoning to the Magyars all the countries under the crown of St. Stephen. There a Magyar state grew up with a liberal and semi-aristocratic parliamentary government, strong enough to impose its will on the small nationalities, but obliged to let the Croats make themselves a self-governing state.

With the rest of the Empire the German government began once more to organize a unitary constitutional system. It succeeded, by means of an electoral system favouring the Germans and property holders, in setting up this system. At one time it united the German liberals with the aristocracy (1867-68); at another it joined the German aristocracy with the Slavic aristoc-

* The anti-Semite agitation may be included among the nationalist struggles. It has been violently manifested by the prosecution of the Jews of Tisza-Eslar, who were accused of the ritual murder of a young girl (1882-83), and by the formation of an anti-Semite party (17 in the Diet of 1884). The Socialist agitation has been limited to the capital, and has been of no political importance.

racies (1879-93). But it has been obliged to sacrifice to the latter a part of its liberal and anti-clerical policy (established after 1867) and a part of the former predominance of the German language; it has let Austria slip back toward the old system, under the authority of nobles and clergy. Then, a new democratic party, by an appeal to patriotism, won the Czechs; the government, alarmed at the growth of democracy, has therefore made good the loss of the Czech party by taking in the German liberal party. It rests on an anti-democratic coalition, directed by the Poles.

BIBLIOGRAPHY.*

BIBLIOGRAPHY.—Bibliographies will be found in the works mentioned under chap. xiii., **Waitz, Krones, Leger**.

DOCUMENTS.—The parliamentary reports and law collections are indicated in **Mühlbrecht**, "Wegweiser zur Literatur der Staatswissenschaften." Practically all the documents and important facts may be found in **Schulthess**, "Europäischer Geschichtskalender," 1 vol. a year since 1860; Austria-Hungary is one of the best treated parts, but from a standpoint very hostile to the Slavs and Magyars.—See also the "Annuaire des Deux Mondes," up to 1870, and the "Annual Register."

For party history see the reviews, the "Grenzboten," the "Preussische Jahrbucher," the "Deutsche Rundschau" since 1874, the "Deutsche Revue" since 1877, "Unsere Zeit," and the "Revue Polit. et Parlementaire" since 1894.

WORKS.—For general histories, **Krones, Leger**, see chap. xiii.—**W. Rogge**, "Oesterreich von Vilagos bis zur Gegenwart," 3 vols., 1872-73; "Oesterr. seit der Katastrophe Hohenwart-Beust," 2 vols., 1879; stops at the Eastern crisis; a journalistic work, very partial to the Germans.

ON NATIONALITIES.—There is a collection of descriptive monographs, "Die Völker Oesterreich-Ungarns." I prefer not to mention the nationalist controversial writings, Czech, Magyar, German, and Polish, like that of **Rieger**, "Le Royaume de Bohême," 1867, **Heinze**, "Hungarica," 1882; they are very numerous and of little historic value.

ON INSTITUTIONS: See the bibl. in **Ulbrich**, "Oesterreichisches Staatsrecht," 1892, Marquardsen coll.—**Jellinek**, "Ungarisches Staatsrecht," same coll., is announced.—The principal treatises are **Ulbrich**, "Lehrbuch des Oesterr. Staatsrechts," 1883; "Handbuch der Oesterr. Politischen Verwaltung," 2 vols. and 1 suppl., 1888-92. Since 1895 a dictionary has been published under the direction of **Mischler** and **Ulbrich**, "Oesterr. Staatswörterbuch."—In English, **Lowell**, "Governments and Parties," vol. ii.—**de Worms**, "Count Beust."—**Forster**, "Life of Déák."—**Dilka**, "Present Position of European Politics."—Valuable articles may be found in the English reviews, particularly the *Westminster*.

* My ignorance of the Magyar and Slavic tongues prevents my preparing a truly scientific bibliog.

CHAPTER XVIII.

THE SCANDINAVIAN COUNTRIES.

Formation of the Scandinavian States.—The three Scandinavian countries, Sweden, Norway, and Denmark, are ancient states formed during the Middle Ages. The three peoples are alike in their origin, language, religion, and conditions of life; they have passed through similar evolutions and their histories are parallel up to the nineteenth century.

The political situation of the three countries was upset by the wars with the French Empire. The modern political life of Scandinavia, like that of Switzerland, the Netherlands, Italy, the Iberian peninsula, and Germany, was aroused by the intervention of France.

Sweden, during Napoleon's alliance with the Tsar, was conquered by Russia, which detached the Grand Duchy of Finland from the kingdom. Irritated by the incapacity of their King, the Swedes revolted and imposed upon him a sort of constitution (the *form of government* of 1809), which replaced the absolute royalty by an aristocratic government.

A French general, Bernadotte, who directed the occupation of Swedish Pomerania, conciliated the Swedish aristocracy; the King, who had no children, adopted him as his heir; Bernadotte, as prince royal, governed in the King's place and joined the Russo-English alliance against Napoleon. The King of Denmark, the absolute sovereign of the two kingdoms of Denmark and Norway, remained Napoleon's ally; the Allies promised Norway to Bernadotte. After the fall of Napoleon, the Danish King was obliged to cede Norway to Sweden (Peace of Kiel, January, 1814), retaining only Denmark and the duchies of Schleswig-Holstein.

Norway, which for four centuries had been treated as a remote province by the Danish government, had lost all political interest. The Norwegians, speaking Danish and having no other literature but the Danish, did not feel themselves a distinct race. The Norwegian patriotic party did not appear until 1810; it

founded the "Society for the good of the Norwegian people," then raised subscriptions for a Norwegian university (1811).

National sentiment grew rapidly. When the news came of the cession of Norway to Sweden the Norwegians determined not to submit to it. The Danish prince who, under the title of viceroy, governed Norway, wished to take advantage of this movement to declare himself King of Norway. But instead of declaring himself an absolute King, as he had first intended, he followed the advice of Professor Sverdrup, and appealed to the nation. He convoked an assembly of notables, then a Diet of 112 members formed of elected representatives and office-holders. The Diet declared that the crown of Norway had been restored to the people by the Danish King's renunciation, and elected Prince Christian Frederick King (May 17, 1814). It then voted a constitution similar to the French Constitution of 1791, founded on the sovereignty of the people, represented by an indissoluble, elective assembly.

Bernadotte came to take possession of the country and offered the Norwegians a viceroy and a constitution. The Norwegians refused. Then war began, and the Swedes were driven back. But it was impossible for Norway to resist the formal order of the great European powers. Christian therefore convoked the representative assembly and induced it to accept his resignation of the crown. But the assembly, while yielding to the King of Sweden, maintained the principle of the sovereignty of the people; it elected Charles XIII. King of Norway, on condition that he should recognise the Constitution of 1814.

A convention made terms between the two countries (1815). There should be a King of Sweden and Norway, a common sovereign in all foreign relations (war and diplomacy); but the two peoples should each preserve its own constitution and government; Norway had its Council of State, performing the offices of a ministry, its Assembly, its Supreme Court, its capital at Christiania, and its bank at Drontheim.

There were henceforth three distinct Scandinavian states. Norway has the same King as Sweden and the same language as Denmark. All three have established the Lutheran Church. All three have experienced during the nineteenth century an economic, political, and literary revival. All three have established religious liberty. This evolution has been parallel, but to understand it in detail each country must be looked into separately.

SWEDEN.

Transformation of the Swedish Constitution.—Swedish society remained aristocratic until the nineteenth century. The south (Scania) was a region of large landowners; the rest, where the soil is less fertile, has only a scattered population of peasants and fishermen, with several mining districts and a few cities. The court, nobles, military officers, office-holders, and Lutheran clergy form the active part of the nation and rule the people; political life is centred about the King at Stockholm.

Sweden had preserved all her old institutions: the Council of State, performing the office of a ministry,—the Diet, divided into four orders, nobles, clergy, citizens, and peasants, voting separately,—the Lutheran Church as the state church, the practice of any other religion being prohibited,—the army (*indelsta*) maintained by assignments of land. Since 1809 the King had been unable to decide any question except in the Council of State, which was composed of two ministers, four secretaries of state, a chancellor, and six councillors, collectively responsible; the government could make laws only through the Diet.

The first reform was one of government. The Council of State in 1840 took the modern form of a ministry divided into seven departments, each forming a service, under the direction of a Councillor of State (foreign affairs, defence, navy, justice, interior, finance, education). Measures are examined by each head of a department, then by the Council; the King signs the decision, which must then be countersigned by the head of the department concerned (except in military matters).

Next religious freedom was established. The ordinance of 1826 on conventicles, which forbade laymen to hold public religious meetings, was repealed in 1858. Religious tolerance was brought into practice; and the law abolished by which only supporters of "the pure evangelical doctrine" could hold offices. In spite of the protests of the Synod and the supreme court of justice, a special law recognised Dissenters the right to spread their religion, at the same time reserving to recognised religious societies the exclusive right of carrying on public worship. The Jews, who until then had been confined to four cities, were permitted to settle in all parts of the kingdom (1873).

The distribution of representation had not been revised, and so was grossly disproportionate to existing conditions. It was estimated, in 1858, that, out of 3,000,000 inhabitants, possessing

537,000,000 rixdalers, 1,194,000, possessing 245,000,000, were cut off from representation; and, owing to the system of voting by orders, 27,000 men, possessing 52,000,000 rixdalers, were sufficient to counterbalance the vote of 2,478,000, possessing 340,000,000.

The great constitutional reform was the transformation of the Diet. A *reform committee* was formed, which organized a campaign of petitions. The two lower orders, citizens and peasants, prayed the King to present a reform scheme; the two privileged orders, nobles and clergy, voted against it (1860). The King then took the part of the reformers. The first step was to establish local assemblies (*Landsting*); they were to be elected by property-holders, without distinction of order. Then the government presented a plan for the complete revision of the Diet (1863).

In 1865 (the legal date of the new constitution is 1866) the two privileged orders resigned themselves to voting the King's plan (the nobles by 361 votes against 294). This was a radical reform. The old Diet of States-General, with its short and irregular sessions, was transformed into a modern type of parliament, with an annual session of four months. The Diet was composed of two Chambers. The "first Chamber" was aristocratic, composed of representatives from the 25 local assemblies, and of representatives from the cities, in the proportion of 1 for every 30,000 inhabitants, elected for nine years, with a high property qualification and no pay for services. The "second Chamber" was composed of deputies elected for three years by the propertied classes and receiving a salary. The proportion of deputies was 1 for each rural district up to 40,000 population, and 1 for every 10,000 in the cities. This gave the cities a decided electoral advantage. The two Chambers had the same powers; they were to make the laws and the budget. If they should disagree on financial questions, they were to meet together, and the vote of the majority was to prevail (a Scandinavian practice).

Swedish Parties.—In Sweden, as in the other Scandinavian states, parties were formed in an exactly opposite fashion from the rest of Europe. The cities, where the court and the officials predominated, formed the aristocratic conservative party (right), disposed to support the ministers chosen by the King. The rural districts formed the democratic party (left), which opposed the ministry.

The right had called itself the "*intelligent party*"; its members were of the cultivated classes; the left, composed mainly of peasants, had taken the name of the "*rustic party*." As in the other Scandinavian countries, the struggle came over the budget of expenses, especially military (army and navy). The King and his ministers, continuing the Swedish military tradition, perhaps also influenced by the example of the German monarchies, wished to reorganize the army on the Prussian model, establishing a permanent army and expending great sums on the building up of a navy. The left, above all bent on economy, rejected these expenditures as useless for a people threatened by no enemy; it demanded that the army should be remodelled on the Swiss plan, as a national militia.

Relations between the ministry and the Second Chamber have been regulated according to the usages of a constitutional monarchy, and the King has avoided establishing the parliamentary system; he has continued to choose his ministers outside of the majority. The Chamber, deprived of means of constraint, cannot get control of the government; it has only its power of resistance to ministerial projects.

Conflict began in 1871 over the question of military reform: the left demanded that the "antiquated system" of the *indelta* should be abolished; the government plan was passed by the First Chamber, but rejected by the Second Chamber (105 against 79).

The ministry kept its majority in the Diet (the two Chambers voting together), owing to the votes of the aristocratic and ministerial upper House. But as early as 1875 the left had a majority, even in the Diet (155 against 141). The ministry has continued to present its schemes, the Diet has continued to reject them; the military reform has not been accomplished. But the conflict has not become sharp as in the other Scandinavian countries. The King has admitted to the ministry the leaders of the moderate section of the rustic party.

Then, the classification of parties has changed. A new democratic party has been formed in the cities, more radical than the Rustics. In 1884 the Conservative party lost Stockholm. Meanwhile the question of taxation was breaking up the old parties. The price of grain had fallen greatly, and a party had formed about 1880 to demand an increase of import duties on grain. The ministry, which had always advocated free trade, resisted for a long time. In 1886 the protectionists had a small

majority in the lower Chamber, though still insufficient to counterbalance the great free-trade majority in the upper Chamber. In 1887 the ministry, having appealed to the nation by a dissolution (the first since the reform of the Diet), the free-trade government party had only 100 votes in 222. The majority depended on the election in Stockholm, which had returned 22 democrats; it was annulled because one of those elected had not fulfilled the property qualification required by law, and the protectionist ticket was declared elected. The ministry resigned, and protective measures were passed. But in 1892 the free-traders regained the majority (142 against 86) in the Second Chamber (128 against 102, in 1896).

The socialist party had just been organized (1889), on the model of the German socialists, by founding political societies and syndicates of workingmen. It began its agitation with a press campaign and a demonstration in favour of the eight-hour day (1890). The government replied with prosecutions for high treason or blasphemy, condemning to prison all the editors of the socialist organ. The socialist party, powerless to effect the election of its candidates by propertied voters, joined the democratic party in an appeal for universal suffrage. The two united parties organized an election for a "people's Diet." This private Diet, held in 1893, presented to the King an address in favour of universal suffrage. The Rustics divided on this question (1893); one part joined the right to defeat the electoral reform (the First Chamber rejected it again in 1896). The government, disturbed by the agitation in the cities, carried, in 1894, a law which, by reducing the number of deputies to 230, lessens the proportion of deputies from the cities. Political life has turned, since that year, on the conflict with Norway (see p. 565).

NORWAY.

The Democratic Party.—After the union with Sweden, Norway had the most democratic form of social and political constitution to be found in Europe. The separation from Denmark had removed the controlling Danish classes; there remained almost nothing of the Norwegian nobility; the officials were few in number and centred at Christiania, a capital without a court. Society was reduced to peasants (who were almost all landowners), merchants, sailors, and pastors. It has been steadily democratic in character.

The government was monarchicai in form; but the King was a foreigner and seen in Norway only when the Assembly met; he therefore had but little personal influence. The Constitution of 1814, based, like the French Constitution of 1791, on the doctrine of the separation of the powers, was so constructed as to make the Assembly entirely independent of the King. Unlike that of other monarchical governments, it could not be dissolved and it could make laws against the will of the King—though, to tell the truth, it was by a slow process. When a measure is rejected by the King it must, in order to become a law, be voted by three successive Assemblies with intervals of three years between the votes.

The Assembly (*Storthing*) was elected for a short term (three years) by indirect election, by an electoral body which was very democratic for the period, for it included every landholder, every city burgher, and every possessor of an income of 500 kroner in the country or 800 kroner in the city.* The Assembly was divided into two Chambers, which sat separately. The Upper Chamber (*Lagthing*) was, however, only a fragment of the *Storthing*, formed of a quarter of the members elected by the whole. The remaining three-fourths constituted the *Odelsthing*, with the sole right of inspecting the accounts. In case of disagreement over a projected law the two Chambers voted together, and the project must in this case have a two-thirds majority.

The King chose the Council of State, which wielded the executive power. This Council, formed of two ministers and nine councillors, was cut into two sections: a minister and two councillors composed the delegation to be with the King at Stockholm; the others remained at Christiania and composed the ministry. Following the doctrine of the separation of the powers, Councillors of State could not be deputies or even enter the *Storthing* hall.

Political life at first commanded little interest. The *Storthing* held only one session of two months in three years. It was, however, divided into two parties on the same principle as in Sweden. The democratic party, composed of representatives from the peasant classes, opposed the expenditure proposed by the government; the right, which favoured the ministry, was supported by the deputies from the capital. But from the beginning, the left had the majority; it had the advantage of appearing as the

* A Krone is roughly equal to a quarter of a dollar.

Norwegian patriots' party, as opposed to the government party representing a foreign king.

Charles XIV. (Bernadotte) was in conflict with the Norwegians throughout his reign (1818-44): conflict over the civil list; conflict over the abolition of the nobility, which the *Storthing* demanded in three successive votes; conflict over the reform of the constitution (the King wished to secure for himself the same powers that were enjoyed by the kings of other monarchies: veto, right of dissolution, appointment of presiding officers; the *Storthing* rejected all his amendments in 1824; conflict in 1829 with students who were celebrating the anniversary of the Norwegian constitution instead of the anniversary of the union with Sweden (the King sent troops to disperse them); conflict over the choice of the viceroy for Norway. This time the King went so far as to dissolve the *Storthing*, which retorted by impeaching the ministry for having advised the King to violate the constitution; the ministry was condemned to pay a fine, and the King yielded, taking a Norwegian for his viceroy.

The two succeeding Kings, Oscar I. (1844-59) and Charles XV. (1859-72), lived in peace with the *Storthing*. Oscar recognised the national flag of Norway and gave up the right of appointing a viceroy (the charge was abolished in 1873). Religious liberty, which had been forgotten in the constitution, was established by laws. The law on Dissenters (1845) gave to all *Christian* sects the right to establish communities and to practice their religion. Jews were given the same privilege in 1851. Universal religious liberty was granted in 1878. Lutheranism remained compulsory for office-holders, however. The *Storthing* session was made annual (1869), and this increased political activity in Norway.

Prosperity increased rapidly. Norway had never been so populous or so rich. The population had increased from less than 1,200,000 souls in 1835 to 1,800,000 in 1875 (2,000,000 in 1891); the population of the cities from 135,000 in 1832 to 332,000 in 1875. The debt, which had been very heavy in 1815, was paid off in 1850. The customs duties, growing more and more productive, were sufficient to cover the expenses of the state. The little Norwegian people owned a fourth of the merchant marine of Europe: in 1879 56,000 sailors and 7800 ships, not to mention the fishermen, who in 1890 were estimated at 120,000. The land was divided among a great number of peasants. The

number of landowners had increased from 45,000 in 1814 to 105,000 in 1835. There remained no great property-holders.

The Constitutional Conflict.—With Oscar II. (1872) began the great conflict for reform of the constitution. Hitherto the democratic party, abiding by the terms of the Constitution of 1814, had simply tried to restrict the government by reducing the budget. It had at first even refused to change the law forbidding Councillors of State to join in meetings of the Assemblies, for fear of their gaining a personal influence over the deputies. It held the old doctrine, the doctrine maintained by the French Constitution of 1791. Later it had proposed a law (1851) which permitted the Councillors of State to take part in the meetings of the *Storting*. The King had rejected it.

In 1872 the democratic party changed its policy; it endeavoured to get control of the Council of State, to compel the King to choose his ministers from the majority in the *Storting*, thus replacing the separatist system by the English parliamentary system. The constitution forbade ministers to sit in the *Storting*; the democratic party passed a law to permit it. Thereupon began the conflict between the King and the *Storting*. The King declared that the *Storting* had no power to change the constitution without the consent of both powers, King and *Storting*; as the constitution had established no other procedure for revision, the change could be made only by agreement. He would willingly consent to the innovation, but in return asked the right of dissolving the Assembly, as in parliamentary monarchies. The majority in the *Storting* looked at the question in a different light. It declared that, as the constitution had made no distinction between laws and constitutional amendments, a law was sufficient to change the constitution, and this could be passed over the King's veto. It therefore passed the law giving the ministers entrance to the *Storting*; the King refused his sanction; but, in accordance with the rules of Norwegian procedure, the *Storting* passed the measure three times (1872-77-80) and passed several formal votes of censure against the ministry.

The King refused to recognise the law, even after the third vote, and chose "fighting ministers" pledged to resistance (1880). The *Storting* had no lawful means of action; according to the doctrine of the separation of powers, the King, in his choice of ministers, was under no obligation to pay attention to the votes of the Assembly. The breach widened. The two

powers, both King and *Storthing*, refused to yield. The *Storthing* replaced the formula "Most Gracious Majesty" with the words "To the King." The King secured from the Law Faculty of Christiania a favourable opinion on his theory. In Sweden there was talk of employing force; in Norway a society was established to arm volunteers. There remained but one process, which was to impeach the Council of State; but the outcome of the attempt was doubtful. According to the constitution, impeached ministers must be tried by a court composed of 9 judges from the High Court of Justice and 22 members of the *Lagthing*, and the accused had the right to challenge a third of them. Nothing could be expected of the judges, who were dependent on the government; the members of the *Lagthing* alone could be expected to decide the conflict against the King.

The elections of November, 1882, were decisive. The Left had 83 members elected, the Conservatives 31. The Left used its majority to elect a *Lagthing* disposed to condemn the ministry. The trial was a long one. The *Odelthing* accused the ministers of having acted contrary to the interests of the country by advising the King to refuse his sanction to the constitutional amendment; the court declared the ministers guilty and condemned them to dismissal (1884).

This time the King yielded and accepted the judgment. He did, however, attempt to form a Conservative ministry, but no one dared accept a place in it. The King finally resigned himself to charging Sverdrup, leader of the Left, with the formation of a ministry (1884). This was a radical change; Norway made a sudden leap from constitutional monarchy to the parliamentary system. The Council of State became a ministry politically responsible to the *Storthing*. The power, hitherto exercised by the King, the Christiania officials, and the conservative party, passed into the hands of the representatives of the Norwegian people under the control of the peasant democratic party.

The National Conflict.—The accession of the leader of the Left to power did not end the conflict; it simply gave it a new direction. The party which had conquered the King was a loose coalition of the various opposition groups; by the side of the old peasant Left, which was still composed of monarchists and intolerant Lutherans, there had sprung up, within a generation, a more radical group, whose members belonged in large part to the cities and ports. It was indifferent or hostile to the Church, and was led by the novelist Björnsterne Björnson.

During the struggle against the King, Sverdrup had produced a program of democratic reforms: extension of the suffrage, establishment of jury trial, reorganization of the army, and development of education (1882). On these reforms the Left was in harmony, but the understanding was broken up on a question of Church policy. Sverdrup, influenced by his nephew John, an Orthodox pastor, caused the rejection of the pension proposed for the writer, Kielland, because the latter had expressed anti-Christian views (1885). Sverdrup proposed a bill on parish councils (1886) which gave the councils the right to strike from the voting list the name of anyone who should have broken away from the Church or who led an immoral life. (In Norway the parish is identical with the civil commune; this bill would give the Orthodox believers a discretionary power over the elections.) The democratic party broke into two parts; the Old Left, supporting Sverdrup, and the New Left, under Björnson, attacking him (1886).*

The two groups continued to vote together on the electoral law (1884), introduction of jury trial, and the reorganization of the army as a militia (1887). But the New Left demanded the dismissal of John Sverdrup and defeated the parish law in the *Storting* (84 against 1). Sverdrup, though put in a minority, refused to resign, invoking the anti-parliamentary theory which he had been fighting all his life. Then, to maintain his position, he joined the Right, which enabled him to defeat a vote of want of confidence by 61 votes (of which 30 were Conservative) against 51 (1888). He even spoke of the necessity of winning the confidence of "the master of the ministry" (the King). The mass of the democrats followed the New Left. The delegates from the democratic clubs, who met at Drontheim in July, 1887, adopted as their platform universal suffrage, the parliamentary system (that is, the resignation of a defeated ministry), and the establishment of special consuls for Norway. By this last article the New Left appealed to patriotism against the King of Sweden.

Henceforth there were three parties: Conservative, Ministerial, and Radical. In the elections of 1889 the coalition of Ministerialists and Conservatives retained their majority: 22 Ministerialists, 54 Conservatives, 38 Radicals. But the Ministerial party was too far reduced to maintain its foothold. The Conservatives, who were now the largest party relatively, defeated

* Björnson's adversaries called it the "literary" or "European Left," because it introduced foreign ideas into Norway.

Sverdrup, and the King took a Conservative "fighting ministry," under Stang (1889).

Then began the democratic and patriotic agitation against the King of Sweden. The factory system had been introduced into Norway, and had created a labouring class. A socialist party had just been formed among the workingmen (1887) and had secured the support of the congress of trade unions (1889). Another Radical workingman's party, represented by the federation of the leagues of Norwegian workingmen, demanded woman's suffrage, a progressive income and inheritance tax, an eight-hour day, and legislation in the interest of workingmen.

When the Conservative ministry presented a bill to regulate relations between Sweden and Norway, the two groups of the Left united and left the government in minority (February, 1891). The King decided to call on one of the Radical leaders Steen. The Steen ministry did not have at first a majority in the *Storting*, but gained a majority in the elections of 1891. The party had adopted a platform of universal suffrage, direct taxes, and particularly the creation of a Norwegian ministry of Foreign Affairs and Norwegian consuls. The elections were very animated; the Radical Left gained 18,500 votes. It elected 65 deputies, the Sverdrup party 14, and the Conservative party 35.

Trouble began at once with the King on the question of Norwegian consuls. The *Storting* declared that the creation of a consular body was an exclusively Norwegian affair, to be settled by Norwegian legislation. The King replied that the right of settling the question belonged to him according to the laws established on the union of the two countries (March, 1892). The *Storting* determined to create consuls; the King refused his sanction; the ministers offered to resign, but the King was obliged to keep them (1892). As at the time of the previous conflict, they were met by a question of procedure; the *Storting* claimed the right of final decision, as the representative of the sovereign people of Norway, while the King affirmed that a change in the relations established by the union could be made only by agreement between the two governments. In Sweden the Diet (April, 1893), in Norway the Right, supported the King. The King once more took a conservative ministry (Stang, April, 1893) and kept it in spite of the *Storting's* vote of want of confidence. The *Storting* retorted by refusing to vote funds for foreign affairs, the civil list, and the ministers (1893), and determined upon a separate consulate for Norway. The Left

won the majority in the elections of 1894 and the contest has remained open. The *Storthing* has continued to vote measures in opposition to the King's ministers—separation of consulates, and later (1896) a Norwegian flag with no symbol of the union. The King has continued to refuse his sanction to the decisions of the *Storthing* (1894) and has retained his conservative ministry, even after it has indicated a wish to resign (1895).

The conflict has provoked a counter movement in Sweden, and has taken the form of a conflict between the two peoples, Norwegians and Swedes. In both countries, the Chambers have manifested a mutual lack of confidence by voting special military appropriations (1895). The Swedish government has proposed a revision of the union compact; but the *Storthing* insisted that the negotiations should be carried on by a ministry which was in harmony with the Norwegian majority; the King has formed a routine ministry, and the conflict goes on.

DENMARK AND THE DUCHIES.

The Danish Monarchy before the Separation of the Duchies.—After the cession of Norway, the Danish monarchy was reduced to the Kingdom of Denmark (comprising Jutland and the islands), Iceland, and the duchies of Schleswig, Holstein, and Laucenburg.

The population was chiefly agricultural, but there remained an extensive nobility which controlled the court and filled the offices. The peasants, who until 1788 had been dependent on the nobles to an extent bordering on serfdom, had not yet any political activity. Copenhagen, the only city of any importance, was the centre of court life. The King preserved the tradition of the "enlightened despotism" of the eighteenth century: religious toleration, patriarchal administration, absolute, secret, and uncontrolled government.

Frederick VI. (1808-39) confined himself to a promise of publishing the budget (1813), which was not carried out before 1835; he also created a set of provincial Estates after the Prussian model, purely consultative, for consideration of laws and financial questions (1831-34). There were four provinces: the Islands, Jutland, Schleswig, and Holstein. The only business which was made public was the regulation of the heavy financial burdens left by the wars of the French Empire. In 1813 the paper money had fallen to one-fourth of its value, and the government had

gone into partial bankruptcy; the debt remained enormous and did not begin to decrease until 1841.

A small liberal aristocratic party had been formed among the cultivated classes in Copenhagen, desiring a constitution and hoping to secure it from the hereditary prince. But Christian VIII. (1839-48), who was now King, became an absolutist. He was besides absorbed by the struggle against his German subjects in Holstein, and died before getting beyond the plan of a constitution (January, 1848).

The whole reign of Frederick VII. (1848-63) was filled with the intrigues, negotiations, and wars of the Schleswig-Holstein affair, and during all that time Danish politics were controlled or disturbed by the quarrels with the duchies.

The Liberals were meanwhile the Danish national party, desiring union with the duchies, or at least with Schleswig, with a single constitution for the whole monarchy. Frederick VII. leaned on this party and formed a Liberal ministry (March, 1848), which repealed the laws against the liberty of the press. He then granted a constitution, the fundamental law of June, 1849, which established an annual Diet composed of two Chambers, elected by the owners of property; it also guaranteed liberty of the press, of religion, and of public meeting.

This constitution, confined to the Kingdom of Denmark, was short-lived. The King then proposed a constitution for the whole monarchy, including the duchies; but this project, drawn up at the time of the general reaction against the representative system, lessened the power of the Diet. The Diet protested; the government replied with press prosecutions, and the King, by virtue of his own authority, promulgated the Constitution of July, 1854. This reduced the Diet to a single consulting assembly having no authoritative vote except in imposing *new* taxes. The Diet voted to impeach the ministry. It was dissolved, but re-elected (1854), and the King changed his ministry. The conflict ended in a compromise; this was the Constitution of October 2, 1855, which reserved to the Diet all its powers and established a common *Council of State* for the whole monarchy, in which the Kingdom of Denmark had 47 representatives (35 elected, 12 appointed by the King), and the duchies 33 (8 appointed by the King). This constitution, declared void by the provincial estates of the duchies, remained in a precarious condition.

The Duchies of Schleswig-Holstein.—The King of Denmark was sovereign of the two duchies of Schleswig and Holstein, and

also of the duchy of Lauenburg (received in 1815 as indemnity for the loss of Pomerania). These duchies were distinct from the Kingdom of Denmark and belonged to the King as *Duke*. They had had each its own history, its distinct administration and Assembly of Estates, though united under the same sovereign, and declared indissolubly united. In 1815, however, when the German Confederation was formed, Holstein and Lauenburg alone were included in it and Schleswig had remained outside. The population of Holstein, Lauenburg, and southern Schleswig was German, that of Northern Schleswig was Danish. Thus, by a contradictory combination of terms, the duchies and Denmark made part of the same monarchy without forming one nation; Holstein, although subject to the Danish government, was a member of a foreign confederation in which Schleswig was not included, although indissolubly united to Holstein; and the limits of the Danish nationality did not coincide with the limits of either province. These contradictions made a rational solution impossible.

The "question of the duchies" was, however, long in coming into prominence, for national feeling was not yet aroused. The Germans in Holstein were used to regarding Denmark as their country; they even sang the Danish national songs.

The agitation began against Frederick, who governed as an absolute sovereign, without consideration for the historic privileges of the knights of Holstein; Dahlmann, the historian, a professor at Kiel, presented their claims in the name of historic rights. In 1830 a more radical agitator, Uwe Lornsen, demanded a single constitution for the two duchies and separation from Denmark. "We have nothing in common with the Danes," he said, "but the King and the enemy." He was arrested, and the King created two assemblies of estates, one for Schleswig, the other for Holstein. But the Germans in Holstein were beginning to object to being Danish; the University of Kiel became a centre of Germanic propagandism.

Conflict then began between the German patriots who wanted a separate administration for the duchies and the Danish patriots who wanted to maintain the united monarchy. Between the two extreme parties came two intermediate parties: a German party in Holstein which renounced Schleswig, and a Danish party which renounced Holstein. But soon all the Germans united to sustain the indissolubility of the duchies.

After the death of Frederick VI. (1839) there remained but two

princes, neither of whom had an heir; these were the later Kings Christian VIII. and Frederick VII. The question of the succession had to be decided. Now the right of succession was not the same all over the monarchy: in Denmark the succession could be inherited by women, in Holstein by men only; in the case of Schleswig and Lauenburg the point was in dispute. The Danish government, however, meant to preserve the monarchy intact, including Holstein, and the German party wished to cut off from it both Holstein and Schleswig as inseparable.

The two parties officially declared their pretensions. The Estates of Holstein, in the petition of 1844, maintained three points: the duchies are (1) *independent*, (2) *united forever*, (3) *hereditary in the male line*. The King replied that Schleswig followed the female line like Denmark, that for Holstein the question was in doubt, but that he would be forced to assure the maintenance of the Danish monarchy (1846). The German party made rejoinder in the form of mass-meetings, a protest from the Estates of Holstein to the king, who refused to receive it, and a complaint to the German Diet. Then appeared the patriotic song of the duchies, *Schleswig-Holstein meerumschlungen*.

The Wars of the Duchies.—The revolution of 1848 excited the national parties and pushed the conflict at length to the point of war. The Danish liberal nationalist party, which the King called to the ministry, had adopted a mixed solution: to renounce Holstein, the German country, which belonged to the Confederation, to keep the country north of the Eider, that is, Schleswig, and to make it one nation with Denmark; this is what was called the party of the “Eider Danes.” This solution implied the rupture of the union between Schleswig and Holstein, a common constitution for Schleswig and Denmark, and for the future succession through the female line for Schleswig. The German party in the duchies, in the name of the indissoluble union, demanded the admission of Schleswig into the Confederation and a common constitution for the duchies; on the refusal of the King the party rose in rebellion and established a provisional government, which declared itself in favour of indissoluble unity, male succession, and the entrance of Schleswig into the Confederation.

From this moment three questions awaited decision: 1. Should Schleswig remain united to Holstein and join the Confederation, or remain outside of the Confederation and joined to Denmark? 2. Should the constitution be common to the

duchies or to Schleswig and Denmark? 3. Should the succession be male or female?

The War began in August, 1848, and lasted until 1850, broken by truces into three wars. The German party had its centre at Kiel and carried on its work through the aid of volunteers or regular troops from Germany. The Danish party carried on its work through the Danish army and the aid of European diplomacy.

1. In the first war the Danish army drove back behind the Eider the Germans of Schleswig-Holstein and German volunteers; the Prussian troops forced the Danish army to evacuate the duchies. The European powers imposed a truce (August, 1848) which established in the duchies a provisional government, half Prussian and half Danish. The Frankfort Parliament rejected the truce by 238 votes against 221, then accepted it by 258 against 238. No definite arrangement could be made, as the Danes wished Schleswig to be inseparable from the monarchy, and the Germans refused.

2. The truce over, the German army of Holstein invaded Jutland, but was surprised and put to rout. A new truce; then Schleswig, evacuated by the Holstein army, was occupied by the Prussian troops and governed by two officers, a Dane and a Prussian (April-July, 1849).

3. After the failure of the German revolution the European powers (England, France, and Russia) decided at the London Conference to uphold the integrity of the Danish monarchy as necessary to the balance of power in Europe. The isolated King of Prussia withdrew his troops. The Holstein army, abandoned by the German states, was crushed by the Danish army in July, 1850.

The King of Denmark resumed possession of the duchies. He declared their union dissolved by a decree (January, 1852). He imposed on them a common constitution with Denmark. The succession was regulated by the powers under the form of a protocol adopted in London (May, 1852): the Prince of Glücksburg, husband of the King's niece, was declared heir of the whole monarchy, including the duchies. The intervention of the powers had decided the questions as Denmark wished. But the solution was not accepted by the Estates of Schleswig and Holstein, nor by the Germanic confederation, nor the male heirs of the duchies (the consent of the nearest heir had been secured but not that of his successor). The Estates of Schleswig and Hol-

stein refused to recognise the female line of succession, protested against the Constitution of 1855, and refused to elect deputies to the Council of State, where the majority was Danish.

The Danish government, treating its adversaries as rebels, dismissed all officials, pastors, and teachers belonging to the German party—also even the professors in the University of Kiel. In some parts of Schleswig it forbade the use of German in the schools. In Germany the Danish domination over the German population of the duchies became one of the grievances of the national party.

Even in Denmark the national party disapproved the King's policy. It insisted upon retaining Schleswig, in spite of the Germans' demands, in the hope of annexing it to Denmark; it did not, however, want to keep Holstein, whose German population, by its systematic opposition, would prevent the establishment of a truly national constitution. This party finally won over the King. A patriotic society, the *Denmark Union*, was founded in 1861, "to resist all attempts at foreign intervention in the home affairs of Denmark, to maintain the Danish nationality in Schleswig and introduce into that country that liberty which was promised by the Constitution of 1849." The King promulgated a regulation which established a special system for Holstein (March, 1862). The German majority in the Schleswig Estates protested, and then resigned their seats; the German Diet at Frankfort voted to *enforce the execution* of its decisions of 1858, 1860, 1861, and 1863. The Danish government replied by presenting a common constitution.

The Separation of the Duchies.—In the midst of the conflict, King Frederick VII. died suddenly, and the question of succession had to be settled. The heir to the Danish throne, Christian IX. of Glücksburg, backed by the London protocol, had himself proclaimed as King in both Denmark and the duchies. He hesitated at accepting the new constitution common to Denmark and Schleswig, as contrary to the London protocol; but the people of Copenhagen, when the patriotic party resigned, came *en masse* to the palace, and Christian signed the Constitution of 1863. In the duchies, on the contrary, the Estates recognised as their sovereign the heir in the male line, Frederick of Augustenburg. Three questions came up at once: the union of Schleswig, the common constitution, and the succession.

The solution came not from the Danes or the inhabitants of the duchies, but from foreign powers. The Germans in the

duchies pinned their hopes on the German Diet, which had already decided to send a federal army; the Danes were counting on the states of Europe that in 1852 had guaranteed the territory of the Danish monarchy. But both parties were deceived. The two great German states, Austria and Prussia, declaring themselves bound by the London protocol, began by recognising Christian. Frederick was supported only by the small states of Germany (see p. 468). Prussia and Austria accepted the succession, but not the Constitution of 1863; they sent to Denmark a demand that it should be abrogated; on the King's refusal they sent their troops into Schleswig (February, 1864). The Danish government awaited the intervention of the European states. The Queen of England, however, did not want war, and Napoleon spoke of having the question settled by a vote of the inhabitants of the duchies, according to the principle of nationality.

The Danish army (35,000 men) had received the order to risk no decisive action; its part was to give European intervention time to make its appearance. It evacuated Schleswig almost without resistance and withdrew behind the entrenchments of Düppel, which covered Jutland; there it held out for six weeks. The position was taken by storm on April 18. On April 25 the conference between the European powers was reopened. England proposed to divide Schleswig; Napoleon, directly consulted by Denmark, accepted the plan, but proposed to divide the duchy according to language. Prussia and Austria demanded the complete cession of the two duchies, which should form a single state. The conference was interrupted (June 25). The armies of Austria and Prussia took possession of the whole of Jutland and threatened the islands. Denmark, abandoned by Europe, resigned herself to signing a peace ceding the three duchies to Austria and Prussia (August, 1864).

Austria and Prussia held to their conquest. In 1866 Austria, after her defeat, gave up her rights over the duchies, and Prussia annexed them. One article of the treaty promised that the "people of northern Schleswig, if by a free vote they should signify their desire to be united to Denmark, should be ceded to Denmark." But Prussia never consulted the people, and in 1878 Austria agreed to cancel that clause. The Danish party in Schleswig remained under Prussian rule; the inhabitants have never ceased to show their discontent by electing always a protester as their deputy. The Prussian government has retorted by persecuting Danish patriots and forbidding the use of the

Danish language. In 1885 sixteen young girls were fined for singing Danish patriotic songs; a bookseller was fined for having offered for sale a book whose covers bore the Danish colors.

The Constitution of 1866.—After the separation of the duchies Danish politics were transformed. A new democratic party, the *Friends of the Peasants*, demanded the abrogation of the existing constitution and the restoration of the Constitution of 1849.

The government presented a plan to re-establish the system of 1849, but with an important change. Of the two Chambers of the Diet, one, the *Folkething*, was still to be a really representative body, elected under a very extended suffrage; but the upper Chamber, the *Landthing*, was to be composed of 66 members, 12 *appointed* by the king, the others *elected* by voters possessing an income of 2000 crowns. The lower house rejected this plan as anti-democratic; it was dissolved, but re-elected (1865); and after a long conflict the government plan became the Constitution of 1866, which rules Denmark to-day.

For the first few years the ministry governed almost without opposition; it was absorbed in the reorganization of the army, navy, and military service. But a great transformation was preparing to take place in public opinion. The "Liberal" party, which had held the ministry during the struggle over the duchies, was before everything a belligerent patriotic party; its program had consisted chiefly in the defence of Schleswig. After the loss of Schleswig it became a conservative party, composed of officials and landowners, the party of the court and middle class; its force lay in the capital (Copenhagen) and its neighbourhood. The rest of the country quickly joined the opposition. It divided into two groups: the Moderate Left, composed chiefly of deputies from the north of the islands and of Jutland; the Democratic Left (Peasants' Friends), recruited principally from the south of the islands and southern Jutland.

As in Norway, the subject of dispute was the budget; the Right supported the King and the ministry, who demanded money for officials and war expenses; the Left wished to reduce expenditure and taxes. As in Norway, the peasants formed the Democratic party, while the capital elected the Conservatives.

At each election the opposition gained seats in the Lower House. In 1870 the groups of the Left joined forces and defeated the budget, whereupon the ministry resigned. The following ministries secured their budgets by only a few votes majority. In 1873 the Left coalition had 49 members, the Right

(national-liberal) only 15; in addition to these was the Third party (15 members) and the "transitional group" (9 members). The coalition demanded an extended suffrage and choice of pastors by the faithful; it rejected the budget and passed a vote of want of confidence in the ministry by 55 votes against 34. The Chamber was dissolved, but the Left was re-elected.

The Constitutional Conflict (1873-94).—The conflict over voting the budget led to a constitutional conflict. The declaration of the Lower House in 1873 placed the question thus: "It is a necessary condition of constitutional monarchy that the government should be in harmony with the house which is elected by universal suffrage." The King must choose a "ministry in harmony with the people's representatives." This was the theory of the parliamentary system in practice in England, Belgium, and France. The King replied that the Chamber misunderstood the conditions of the constitution (1873); he considered himself entitled to keep a ministry which one of the Chambers supported; he declared (1883) that "understanding was possible only through negotiation between the *two Chambers*." This was the theory of harmony between the three powers and equality between the two Chambers, which Bismarck had imposed on Prussia.

The conflict was interrupted by a compromise ministry (1874), but went on under the "fighting ministry" (Estrup) formed in 1875. The Left, in spite of dissolutions (1876; 1878; May, 1881; July, 1881), retained its large majority in the *Folkething*; after the dissolution of 1876 it controlled three-fourths of the votes. The ministry, however, refused to retire, and the Chamber could not get rid of it by impeachment because the *Landthing*, which would have sat in judgment on the trial, had been, since the promulgation of the Constitution of 1866, controlled by the court.

The *Folkething* began to refuse the budget, not simply as presented by a ministry which did not possess the confidence of the country, but because the ministry, following the belligerent traditions of the national-liberal party, demanded great sums for the navy and for fortifying Copenhagen. The Democratic party held that Denmark, not being threatened by Germany, had no need of costly armament. The *Landthing*, of course, supported the ministry. Each year the *Folkething* rejected the budget, each year the *Landthing* voted it, and the ministry acted on it by means of a *provisional* financial law. This expedient, em-

ployed since 1877, was based on Article 25 of the constitution: "The King may, in case of urgency, when the Diet is not assembled, decree provisional laws. . . These laws must always be brought before the Diet at its next session." This interpretation, similar to that made by Charles X. in the French *Charte*, did not rid the ministry of the obligation to secure the approval of its provisional budget for the following year. The Left did not agree on its policy. The moderate group, to avoid rupture with the ministry, consented to vote a compromise budget, omitting the expenditure for fortifying Copenhagen (1882), and let the provisional financial law become a custom.

The Democratic Left (*Berg*), which opposed every form of conciliation, finally won the majority in the *Folkething* in 1884. For the first time part of Copenhagen escaped the Conservatives, the socialists gaining three members there (out of 9). The contest then became sharp. The *Folkething* declared that "any discussion of reform with the present ministry was a waste of time," and refused to examine any projects. This meant open war between the Democratic nation as represented by its elective Chamber, and the King, as master of the ministry and supported by the aristocracy—a similar contest to that in Prussia from 1862 to 1866.

As in Prussia, the ministry, which in its executive function was the controlling force, had the power to govern outside of legal formalities, in the name of the interest of the state. Not only did it continue to spend money on objects authorized by the *old* budget without the consent of the Lower House, but it also introduced *new* items of expenditure for army expenses, carried them through the Upper House, and added them to the provisional budget. Henceforth there was no longer a legal budget in Denmark. In order to put a stop to the demonstrations of discontent, the ministry had the *Landthing* pass other *provisional laws*, increasing the number of police and gendarmerie, and limiting liberty of the press and of public meeting (1885); it secured the imprisonment of the head of the Democratic party, Berg, who was accused of having "encouraged rebellion" in a public meeting. Denmark lived under a *régime* of special measures, as if under martial law.

The ministry, armed with force against a disarmed nation, succeeded finally in discouraging resistance. The Democratic party, worried by personal rivalries, broke up. In 1884 the "Danish Left," under Berg, the former peasant party, separated

from the "literary Left" under a group of writers (Hörup, Brandès), which was analogous to the "European Left" in Norway, a primarily urban party, demanding universal suffrage and social reforms. The literary Left worked in harmony with the socialist party, organized in 1878 as the workingmen's party, but later recruited in the country districts also, especially in Jutland.

In 1888 the Left, cut into four sections, disputed over its policy. Berg wanted to continue the policy of obstruction. A congress of the opposition parties determined to negotiate with the ministry, and secured an amnesty and the abolition of the special laws of 1885. Finally, Berg being dead (1891) and Hörup not being re-elected, the Democratic party lost the majority. In the *Folkething* of 1892 it had only 29 members against 38 of the moderate Left and 32 of the ministerial party. The moderate Left voted the budget and the military laws (1894); then only did Estrup retire, with the thanks of the King. The conflict ended in victory for the King and his ministers.*

Like the Norwegians, the Danes, in the midst of political conflict, have produced their most brilliant generation of writers, a number of novelists of European reputation; they have attained an unprecedented degree of prosperity. The population, which had at least doubled between 1800 and 1870, has continued to increase (from 1,794,000 in 1870 to 2,185,000 in 1890). The merchant marine, between 1870 and 1890, increased by 700 ships and 85,000 tons. The national debt, increased to 380,000,000 in 1866, was reduced in 1891 to 250,000,000, and the budget has almost always shown a surplus.

Iceland.—While the Danish conflict was in progress, the government engaged in conflict with Iceland. In 1874 the island, hitherto governed by a sort of patriarchal system, received a constitution. A Chamber (*Althing*) of 36 members, 6 appointed by the King, 30 elected by universal suffrage, had the legislative power; the executive power was vested in a resident governor, and a minister for Iceland in Denmark. The opposition, which was in majority in the *Althing*, demanded a ministry for Iceland independent of Danish policy, also financial independence.

The Constitution of 1893 finally established home rule in Iceland. The island no longer contributes to the treasury of the

* In the elections of 1895 the Left regained the majority (54 against 24 of the Right and 27 of the Third party). The socialist members increased from 2 to 8.

monarchy; the Secretary for Iceland resides at Copenhagen and is responsible for the maintenance of the constitution. The *Althing* is composed of two Chambers: the Upper Chamber of 6 members, appointed by the King, and 6 elected by the Lower House; it has the right to complain of the governor, but the King reserves the right to decide such cases.

BIBLIOGRAPHY.*

BIBLIOGRAPHY.—For periodical bibliographies of Scandinavian countries, see **Ch.-V. Langlois**, "Manuel de Bibl. Hist.," p. 157.—The bibl. of the history of institutions is given in the monographs of the Marquardsen collection.

DOCUMENTS.—The official documents are indicated in the bibl. of the Marquardsen coll. (the texts of the constitutions are in **Dareste**, "Les Constitutions"). The reproduction and analysis of chief of these, as well as the story of events, may be found in the three annuals: "Annuaire des Deux Mondes" up to 1870, **Schulthess**, "Europ. Geschichtskalender" since 1860 (in which the Scandinavian countries receive inadequate attention), and the "Annual Register" in particular, the best of the three for the Scandinavian countries.

WORKS.—**COMPLETE HISTORIES**: **Allen**, "Hist. of Denmark" (Fr. tr.), 1878, stops at 1866.—**Thorsae**, "Den Danske Statspolitiske Historie," 2 vols., 1872-78, goes from 1800 to 1848.—**H. Weitmeyer**, "Le Danemark, Hist. et Géogr.," 1889, popular synopsis.—**Boyesen**, "The Hist. of Norway," 1886; a good brief account.—**Save**, "Sveriges Historia under den Nyaste Tiden," 1890, a popular work.

ON THE DUCHIES OF SCHLESWIG-HOLSTEIN: See **Waitz**, "Quellenkunde der Deutschen Gesch.," 1894 edit.; Nos. 6174 to 6203 and 6272 to 6286; bibl. of works in every language.

Information concerning political life in the Scandinavian countries may be found in the German and English reviews (see bibl. of chap. ii-iv., and xv-xvi.).

HISTORY OF INSTITUTIONS: **Aschehoug**, "Staatsrecht d. K. Schweden-Norwegen," 1886.—**Goos** and **Hansen**, "Staatsrecht Dänemarks," 1889, both in the Marquardsen coll.—**Berencreutz**, "Droit Constitutionnel du Royaume de Suède," 1886, Stockholm.

* Being unacquainted with the Scandinavian languages, I have been able to prepare only a brief bibliography, which gives no idea of the activity of literary production in the Scandinavian countries.

CHAPTER XIX.

THE RUSSIAN EMPIRE AND POLAND.

The Russian Empire in 1814.—The Tsar's Empire in Europe had its territory complete as early as 1814. It was, without counting his Asiatic possessions, by far the largest of the European states; the total population in 1815 was estimated at 45,000,000. It was composed of several groups of peoples united by a series of conquests under the same rule, who preserved their own particular dress, language, and religion, and lived side by side without blending. As the Russian government's struggle against these nationalities is one of the leading facts in the history of Russia during the nineteenth century,* it is necessary to give an exact representation of the incongruous bits which combined to make the Russian Empire:

1. Greater Russia, the original centre and the most important part of the Empire, had a Russian population speaking the Russian language (*Greater-Russian* dialect) and belonging to the Orthodox Greek Church. The Dissenters (*Old Believers*), who had been separated from the official Church since the reform of the liturgy in the seventeenth century, formed numerous sects, though forbidden by law.

2. Lesser Russia (Kiev, Ukraine), a Russian district partially subject to Poland, and later reconquered, had also a population speaking the Russian language and belonging to the Orthodox Church. But the *Lesser-Russian* dialect is sufficiently different

* It would be difficult, in a political history, to give the Russian Empire the space due to its importance. This empire, by means of its autocratic constitution, has escaped the public agitations which constitute modern political life. Except for the liberal period under Alexander II., its political history is particularly that of the court and the government, as in the absolute monarchies of the eighteenth century; and this history is in great part kept secret from us: it is almost unknown except through the accounts given by opponents of the government, which are published abroad and are beyond government control, or through official acts and articles in official publications. The internal history of Russia has in any case less place in this chapter than the struggles of the government against its Polish, socialist, and dissenting opponents.

from literary Russian to have a distinct popular literature, and the Orthodox religion was not the only one in practice; for, without speaking of the Protestant German colonies, a population of Polish Jews had settled in the cities and even in the villages, and a number of Orthodox believers had joined the Catholic Church under the form of *United Greeks*, preserving their married clergy and Slavic liturgy.

3. The country to the east of the Volga, formerly a group of Tartar monarchies, was inhabited by a mixture of Russians and the yellow races from Asia, mainly Orthodox, but partly Mussulmans.

4. Southern Russia, composed of territory taken from the Ottoman Empire, was peopled by Russian colonists, the Cossacks, and tribes of Asiatic origin, interspersed with German colonies which had settled with the promise of preserving their nationality. Bessarabia, which had been detached from Moldavia in 1812, had a Roumanian Orthodox population mixed with Polish Jews. This southern region had no unity either of race, tongue, or religion.

5. Caucasia, which Alexander I. had begun to annex, was a conglomeration of little peoples, some Christian (Armenians), others Mussulmans (Circassians), but all warlike, whose subjection was not completed until 1864, and who have preserved their separate national life—the only exception being that certain princely families, particularly in Georgia, have mingled with the Russian aristocracy. This district was and still is the military frontier of the Empire, occupied by armies and military colonists, under a military government.

6. Western Russia, the old Grand Duchy of Lithuania, which Catherine II. had annexed, was composed of old Russian countries (*White Russia*), with an Orthodox Russian population, formerly subdued by the Lithuanians—and of a Lithuanian country in which a portion of the population still preserved the Lithuanian dress and speech, while another portion, particularly the aristocracy, considered themselves a Polish people. White Russia was Orthodox, but its nobility was Catholic; Lithuania proper was Catholic, but with a large proportion of Jews.

7. The Baltic provinces (Esthonia, Livonia, Courland) had a population of two classes, one subject to the other. The primitive inhabitants, Finns and Lithuanians, who were still in the condition of peasants, formed a lower class and preserved their national speech. All the upper classes, the nobility, clergy, and

townspeople, were descendants of German colonists, spoke German, and followed German ways of living. The Tsar, in receiving them as subjects, had promised to preserve their customs and privileges. All the inhabitants were Lutherans. The district of St. Petersburg (formerly Ingria), cut off from the Baltic provinces, had lost its original character; it was a mixture of all the languages and all the religions in the Empire—the residence of the court and the officials.

Siberia and later Asiatic Russia were more like colonies than provinces. The Duchy of Finland and the Kingdom of Poland, newly acquired by Alexander, remained distinct states, in which the Tsar was Grand Duke or King.

The Russian Empire was thus, like the Austrian Empire, a conglomeration of peoples; a single tie bound them together, subjection to the power of the *autocratic* Tsar, their absolute, uncontrolled sovereign. The political and social system had remained what Peter the Great and Catherine had made it. Society consisted of two classes, one subject to the other: the peasants, the great majority of whom were serfs of the crown or of the nobility, and subjected to the knout, the poll-tax, and military service; they paid the taxes to the government, rents to the nobles, and furnished the soldiers (military service was for 25 years): the landlord nobles (about 100,000 families), who were exempt from the knout, poll-tax, and military service, were supported by the peasants and filled the civil and military offices. The middle classes were of almost no consequence. The secular or *white* clergy, the *popes*, married, ignorant, poor, excluded from high office, had almost no part but to conduct the church ceremonies; the regular or *black* clergy, the monks, who alone could become bishops and abbots, were strangers to society. The merchants, although organized in corporations and officially recognised as a class, were scarcely above the peasants, and had neither education nor political life; except for the government residences, the Russian cities were simply enormous villages.

There were thus two classes of society, one placed above the other: underneath were the peasants, merchants, *popes*, and monks, who were still Eastern, Orthodox, strangers to any sort of culture or political interest; above were the nobles and the officers of the government, who had become Westernized, sceptical, and disposed to adopt all the political ideas of Europe, as well as its fashions and language. Between these two classes of society there was no mutual interest, not even that of language.

The high aristocracy spoke almost nothing but French; a number of the offices were filled by Germans from the Baltic provinces.

The government had this same incongruous character. At bottom it was still, like the people, eastern and patriarchal—that is, despotic: a single power, the *autocratic* Tsar, the absolute master, no other government centre than his residence, no law but his decrees (*ukases*), no public authority but his officials, no institutions but those he was pleased to establish. But it had pleased the Tsars to establish European institutions; and Russia had a European capital (St. Petersburg), European diplomacy, an army organized on the German system, a European centralization of the government, with councils and committees, European courts with written secret procedure, European police, taxes, and monopolies copied from Europe, division into *gubernies* (governments) and *districts*, assemblies of nobles under the presidency of a marshal chosen from the nobles after the German fashion. Even the Orthodox Church, the only national institution, was subject to an ecclesiastical college, the *Holy Synod*, and to a lay officer copied from Europe, the High Proctor of the Holy Synod, who proposed the appointments of the prelates and all ecclesiastical measures.

This was the “enlightened despotism” of the eighteenth century, without any sort of political liberty for subjects. The government admitted neither liberty of the press nor of public meeting, neither deliberative assemblies nor public demonstrations without authorization, neither control over the actions of officials nor guarantee against their abuse of power. Even religious freedom was limited by the state Church. All previous creeds of peoples annexed were protected by special promises from the Tsar; every Protestant, Catholic, Jew, or Mussulman subject was free to practise his religion. But no Orthodox subject could leave the official Church; conversion of an Orthodox to any other religion was forbidden under heavy penalty, and Dissenting sects (*raskol*) which broke away from the old Church, were pursued like criminals. Toleration was limited to foreign religions.

This system had never been perfectly applied. The Russian officials, accustomed to the indolent and arbitrary ways of the Eastern countries, let matters drag along, and eventually decided them by caprice or for bribes. They lost their heads in the European complication of bureaux and in the enormous mass of *ukases*, which were often contradictory.

The Government of Alexander I.—Alexander I., brought up by a Vaudois, Laharpe, and imbued with liberal and humanitarian ideas, had attempted to restore order in the central government by regulating the work of his ministers; * they had to meet in committee to decide together on current affairs, but they did not form a ministry, and the general direction of policy still depended on the personal influence which was brought to bear upon the Tsar. Peter the Great's Senate was reduced to the functions of a court of justice. The Council of State, established in 1810, was simply a consultative assembly, to give advice on projected laws.

Alexander I., following the advice of Speranski, the son of a *pope*, an experienced official, who advocated European reforms, had tried to emancipate the serfs, reorganize education, codify the laws, and reorganize finance; these reforms were only partially accomplished. After his rupture with France (1811) he fell under the influence of the anti-French patriotic party, Orthodox and absolutist, and of his aide-de-camp Araktchéieff. After 1815, deceived by Metternich, who represented to him the dangers of revolution, he gave up all idea of reform and left his officials to restore the customs of the eighteenth century. Russian political life withdrew into secret societies and Free Mason lodges, whose members were taken principally from among the high officials of state and army.

Alexander remained the autocratic Tsar in his Empire of Russia, but he wished to be a liberal sovereign in his new European states.

Finland and the Constitutional Kingdom of Poland.—Alexander had promised to leave the Grand Duchy of Finland in possession of its constitution. As in the Baltic provinces, the population was entirely Lutheran, but formed of two classes, one subject to the other. The country people, descended from the old Finnish population, preserved the Finnish language and dress; all the privileged classes, nobles, pastors, and bourgeois, were Swedish; Swedish was the official language of the government. Finland, after coming under the Tsar's rule, retained its Diet of four Estates, modelled after the Swedish system (until 1863 it

*In 1802, 8 ministers had been established: war, navy, foreign affairs, finance, commerce, justice, education, and interior. In 1811, 4 were added: police, roads and canals, foreign creeds, and control. After various changes, there were, in 1896, 12 ministers, including the Proctor of the Holy Synod.

was not convoked). It preserved its autonomy complete, its laws, courts, currency, postal system, even its customs duties. The civil government was still intrusted to the Finnish Senate, divided into two sections, justice and finance, to native office-holders and municipalities, which meant the Swedish nobility and middle class. Swedish remained the language of the administration.

The new Kingdom of Poland, created in 1815 from the former Grand Duchy of Warsaw, included only a bit of ancient Poland,* the district assigned to Prussia in the last division of Poland (1795); but this bit was Warsaw, the heart of the Polish nation in modern times. Alexander, disposed, through his friendship with Princess Czartoryski, to respect the Polish nation, made Poland an independent state, joined to Russia by a personal union alone. The Tsar bore simply the title of King there. The Kingdom of Poland kept all its institutions distinct, its Catholic Church, with its donations and privileges, its schools conducted in the Polish tongue, its currency, postal system, and customs duties, its administration, even its army. Its officials, clergy, and army officers were all Poles; offices were reserved to natives. The only outsiders were the Viceroy, the Tsar's representative, and the Imperial Commissioner.

Alexander had held to his plan of making his kingdom a constitutional monarchy, in spite of the advice of the absolutists. The Charter of December, 1815, guaranteed to the kingdom a native administration and created a Diet composed of a Senate of 30 members, appointed by the King, and a deputation of 60 nuncios, elected by the nobles and the cities. The Diet was convoked only once in two years, and then for a short session; its deliberations were directed by an Imperial Commissary. Its power was limited to voting the laws and new taxes; it had no influence over the ministry, which was responsible to the King alone; it had not even the right to censure the actions of the government. During the session of 1818 Alexander reminded it that it "had met simply to give its opinion on questions which the government judged it necessary to submit to its examination."

It was therefore a very imperfect system of constitutional liberty with a freedom of the press very much restricted by the censorship of newspapers. But at this period of absolutism, no

* The chief part had been at first (eleventh or twelfth century) the province of Posen, annexed to Prussia in 1793, then until the end of the Middle Ages it had been Lesser Poland (Galicia), which Austria had annexed.

other people of central Europe had as much political liberty as the Poles.

Society remained aristocratic in form. The peasants, freed from serfdom since 1807, but without having received lands, remained in the condition of day-labourers or tenants, at the mercy of the land-holding nobles. The population of the cities, partially composed of Jews, had taken almost no part in public life. The high nobility and clergy retained the management of the country.

The ministry, composed of former partisans of Napoleon, was at first controlled by Lubecki, a Lithuanian Catholic, who was little in favour of the constitutional system and occupied chiefly with the material interests of the kingdom. He succeeded in establishing the Bank of Poland and the Loan Association, which regulated the debt. Material prosperity increased. From 1815 to 1830 the population increased by a million and a half. Great cloth factories were established at Lodz. Polish bonds went up; the finances were so well ordered that the kingdom was able to advance one year's taxes to the Russian government.

This system did not, however, become popular in Poland; it checked both patriotism and liberalism. The patriots did not accept a Kingdom of Poland reduced to the dimensions of the Grand Duchy of Warsaw; they demanded at least the former provinces of Lithuania which the Tsar had left outside. The Liberals accused the government of violating the Charter of 1815 by dismissing permanent judges, arresting members of the Diet, subjecting books to censorship, and closing the primary schools. People complained of the Imperial Commissioner, Novosiltzow, and still more of Viceroy Constantine, the Tsar's brother, a whimsical lunatic who forbade broad-brimmed hats, and with his own hand cut off the brims of offending hats.

The Diet attempted to warn the Tsar. He replied that his subjects must have unlimited confidence in his principles of Christian morality (1820); then declared that Poland's "existence was threatened if she did not show herself capable of maintaining herself in the system which had been bestowed upon her." Secret societies, copied from Europe, had been formed among the young men. One of these, the *Patriotic Club*, made its members swear to "devote their lives to the re-establishment of their unfortunate and dearly loved country." The Russian police discovered it; a court-martial condemned Lukazinski to hard labour (1824) for the mere fact of having belonged to a secret society.

Alexander finally forbade the Diet to make its deliberations public (1825) and arrested the leader of the opposition, who was made a prisoner on his own estate under the perpetual watch of a policeman.

The Insurrection of December, 1825.—Alexander, who at the end of his life had become an absolutist Tsar, died without leaving a son. His nearest heir, his brother Constantine, had before this renounced the crown, preferring to remain Viceroy of Poland, as he had married a Polish woman. His younger brother Nicholas, who was still in Russia, was designed as the successor to the throne; but, at the death of Alexander, he at once recognised Constantine as Tsar, and had the oaths taken in his name—awaiting a new renunciation before having himself proclaimed Tsar.

The Russian malcontents tried to take advantage of this interregnum to make a liberal revolution. There were then three secret societies in Russia, copied from those in western Europe, especially the *Carbonari*; their members, as in Spain and Italy, came from the most active part of the population at that time, the army officers. Their political ideas were confused; they wished to bring into Russia the institutions of western civilization, but they seem to have been unable to agree on their model. The *Northern Society*, founded at Petersburg, wanted a constitutional monarchy; the *Central Society*, recruited in the garrisons of Lesser Russia, preferred a republic; the *United Slavs* inclined toward federation. The leaders had concerted a military insurrection for January 1, 1826. The death of Alexander decided them to hasten it a few days; the conspiring officers took advantage of the changed situation by making the soldiers believe that the rightful Tsar was Constantine. Two regiments at Petersburg rose with the cry of "Long live Constantine and the constitution!" (To the soldiers this constitution was Constantine's wife.) After a moment of surprise, the revolt was checked, and the rebellious soldiers denounced each other. In the central part of the country the conspirators were arrested before taking action (December, 1825).

The revolt of the *Decabrists* (December) ended in an enormous prosecution; there were 321 accused, almost all nobles, and 5 were condemned to death. The dramatic execution of Pestel and Riléief was an event known all over Europe. This revolt made a deep impression on the new Tsar, Nicholas, and confirmed his aversion for European liberalism. To watch the sus-

pects, a ministry of political police was established under the name of the *third section of the Chancellery*.

The Polish Insurrection (1830-32).—Nicholas had agreed to be crowned King in Poland and to wear the Polish uniform. But he ceased to convoke the Diet and left the government of Poland to absolutists, who spoke of revoking the Charter of 1815; one of them declared: "It is no longer a question of discussion, but of obedience."

This system irritated all the Poles, but they could not agree on the course to pursue; they divided into two parties. The great landowners, high officials, and clergy, still preferred to be subjected to Nicholas' despotism rather than expose the Polish nation to complete destruction: Poland would await his death before taking up her constitutional life again, but she would maintain her independence. This was the prudent aristocratic party, nicknamed the *Whites*. The students of Warsaw, who admired France and the Revolution, wanted open strife against the Tsar for the defence of liberty and the re-establishment of Poland with her old boundaries. This was the patriotic democratic party, known as the *Reds*, directed by secret societies in communication with the *Carbonari*. In 1825 the leaders had had interviews with the Russian *Decabrists*, but had been unable to agree on the boundaries of Poland; they were prosecuted before the Senate, and acquitted.

Until 1830 the *Whites* kept the *Reds* in check. But the French revolution of 1830, so easily victorious, excited the fighting party. The Tsar called to the Polish army to send it against the revolutionists in France and Belgium. The revolutionists seized the moment when the national army was ready to march against the revolution and used it against the Tsar. The students in the military school surprised the Palace of Warsaw at night. Constantine was alarmed and fled half-clad; then, losing his mind, he withdrew from the kingdom, taking with him the Russian troops and officials (November-December, 1830).

The Poles, abandoned by the Russian government, sent delegates to Constantine, begging him to return, but he refused. The *Whites*, who wished before all to avoid war, decided to form a provisional government to maintain the authority of the Tsar. Chlopicki consented to take command of the troops, in order to prevent their following the revolutionary leaders; he took the dictatorship "in the King's name," and wrote to Nicholas an appeal to his nobility of soul, excusing the Poles by "an unprece-

dented chain of circumstances." He asked for withdrawal of the Russian army. The Tsar replied with a manifesto which demanded submission or death. He refused the Polish envoys to retract the manifesto or to make any promises. The Poles, he said, must trust their sovereign's word, and he added: "The first cannon-shot will be Poland's ruin."

The conciliatory *Whites* gave up the direction of the provisional government to the belligerent *Reds*. The Diet proclaimed the fall of the Romanoff dynasty and the indissoluble union of Poland and Lithuania (January, 1831). Official envoys were sent to ask help from the great powers which had made the treaties of Vienna. In England, Palmerston declared that the Congress of Vienna had not guaranteed the constitution of Poland. In France, in spite of public demonstrations, the government refused to join in a war. Poland was abandoned.

The Polish army, already mobilized, took the initiative by entering Lithuania. But when Dibitsch arrived with his great force (120,000 men against 45,000), the Poles fell back toward the Vistula. They made heroic resistance in five battles, from February to May, 1831. The cholera checked operations. The Russian army, renewed by re-enforcements, finally arrived before Warsaw. The general offered amnesty and the constitution; the Polish generals advised acceptance. But the democrats controlled Warsaw; they had just massacred a number of suspects in the prisons; they refused to treat with the Russians. Warsaw was bombarded, and surrendered, September, 1831. The Diet withdrew; the remains of the Polish army passed into Russia and Austria. A large Polish emigration, composed chiefly of nobles, went to France and settled there.

Poland remained under a military dictatorship. Nicholas took away her independence by an *ukase*: "Poland shall be henceforth a part of the Empire and form one nation with Russia." He abolished the Charter of 1815, replacing it by the Organic Statute of February, 1832. He suppressed the Diet and the Polish army, and gave the power to a Russian governor, Russian officials, and a section of the Council of St. Petersburg. He promised still to leave to the people their church, their language, and their distinct administration; but this promise, which was without guarantee, was not kept.

Paskiewitch, the new Viceroy of Poland, held an absolute power to the day of his death (25 years); he surrounded himself with Russian officials and officers, and kept the kingdom under

a military reign of terror. Orders were given to illuminate in honour of the Organic Statute. Two hundred and eighty-six *émigrés* were condemned to death; their estates were confiscated and distributed to Orthodox Russian generals. The government suppressed the University of Warsaw and closed most of the educational institutions. It forbade all associations, even reading clubs, permitting only the Loan Association. It forbade public meetings, except private evening entertainments, on condition that the number of invitations should be limited and police agents received. It subjected books and even music to a censorship which admitted no foreign book; it made the Russian language compulsory for all officials. All political offences, and even some others, were judged by military commissions. In 1835 Nicholas made at Warsaw a famous speech: "If you persist in holding to your dreams of separate nationality, independent Poland, and all these fancies, you will involve yourselves in great misfortunes. I have built a citadel, and I declare to you that at the least sign of uprising I will batter down the city."

The Empire under Nicholas (1825-35).—The Tsars since Peter the Great had kept up the absolutist *régime*, but, being indifferent to religious differences, they admired the monarchies of civilized Europe and sought to imitate them. Nicholas not only abhorred constitutions and liberal forms of government, but he despised European life. Being a confirmed Orthodox, he felt it a sacred duty to shut out from "Holy Russia" the ideas of the heretical West. His reign, which lasted from 1825 to 1855, was distinguished from preceding reigns by an attempt to break with Western civilization and to restore the old Russian system in the Empire.

Communication with Europe became difficult; such foreigners as were allowed to enter Russia, were watched by the police; all books and papers were stopped at the frontier by censors. Russian law did not recognise, and does not yet recognise, the right of subjects to leave the Empire; under Nicholas, a personal permit from the Tsar was required; he gave it rarely and for five years at the most; to emigrate was and is a crime punishable with transportation and confiscation.

The Russians, shut off from the rest of the world, retired within themselves. Literature, hitherto imitated from the West, took on a Russian character; it began to express a patriotic feeling of admiration for ancient Russia. Under Nicholas, the first original Russian novelists appeared. It was then that the

national hymn was composed, "God Protect the Tsar," and the national opera, "Life for the Tsar."

Nicholas seems to have been devoted to the work of rebuilding the old Orthodox Russia. But, as officials were controlled only by other officials, the control was always imaginary. The venality of employees of every sort, their negligence in the conduct of affairs, their insolence toward persons under their administration, their servility toward superiors, became so notorious that the Tsar himself approved the work of Gogol in putting them into his comedy of "The Inspector." The subjects had not even a means of protesting; newspapers were forbidden to discuss official acts, individuals to concern themselves with politics. In 1848, at Petersburg, a number of young men, officers, employees, and professors had adopted the habit of meeting in the evenings to read and discuss European publications. The police arrested 32 of them (1849); they were condemned to death, pardoned just before execution, and their sentence commuted to hard labour; one of them, Dostoïevsky, later wrote his recollections of the convict prison.

There were also, under Nicholas, a number of religious persecutions, against the sect of *Old Believers*. Penal laws, still in force, were adopted against the conversion of Orthodox believers to any other religion. Abjuration is punished with confiscation and from 8 to 10 years of hard labour; the attempt to convert an Orthodox believer by a sermon or a writing is punished with 8 to 16 months' imprisonment, and at the third offence with exile to Siberia; a person who neglects to hinder the conversion is liable to imprisonment. Every mixed marriage must be celebrated before a *pope*, and the children of such marriages brought up to Orthodoxy; any dissenting pastor who should perform such a marriage would be prosecuted. (This provision, abolished in 1865, was re-established in 1885.)

Under this reign began the attempt to Russianize by force the subjects in the western provinces. In the Polish provinces of Lithuania, the Uniate peasants (Catholic Greeks) received orders to accept Orthodoxy; then an assembly of Greek bishops declared the Uniate Church free from the Roman clergy and given over to Orthodoxy (1839). In the Kingdom of Poland, in spite of the Tsar's promise, the government persecuted the Catholics, closing the churches and convents under legal prettexts, forbidding sermons not authorized by the censor, as well as the employment of Catholic teachers. It laboured to suppress the remains of

Polish autonomy, subjected the schools to the Russian ministry of education (1839), transferred to the Senate at Petersburg the functions of the Council of State and the Court of Cassation (1841), and extended to Poland the Russian penal code.

At the end of the reign, even German, the official language of that army lacked direction, material, and management—all that the government correspondence should be carried on in Russian, and that officials must speak Russian. But it was not carried into effect.

The "Nicholas system" was denounced all over liberal Europe as a finished form of Eastern despotism; the literature of the period is filled with maledictions against "the autocrat" and his government. Nicholas was the symbol of absolutism in the struggle against liberal revolution, and loved to attribute this rôle to himself. A military sovereign before all, always dressed in uniform, busied in reviewing and watching his troops, he believed his army the best of its time; and in the period which followed 1848 he seemed the arbiter of Europe and the future conqueror of the Ottoman Empire. The Crimean war showed that that army lacked direction, material, and management—all that which demands orderly habits and control. Conquered by the Westerners whom he despised, Nicholas died broken-hearted and his system fell through (1855).

✓ **Liberal Reaction against the "Nicholas System."**—Alexander II. spoke of his father with respect and retained the staff which had served him; but, as a humane and educated sovereign, he shrank from the system of compression and isolation; he therefore revived the imitation of the civilized societies of Europe. Without wishing to bind himself by a constitution, he announced his intention of making reforms and appealed to the nobles for assistance.

Immediately public opinion, which had remained hidden until now, sprang into life. It was shown among the educated nobles and students, known in Russia as the *intelligenzia*—the intelligent part of the nation. The Crimean war had suddenly changed the tone of society: the *Tchinovniks* (officials), responsible for malfeasances and neglects which defeat had exposed, had lost their assurance and dared not hinder criticism of their actions. The censorship was not suppressed, but, feeling itself no longer in favour, it relaxed its efforts. No newspaper published in Russia was as yet able to speak freely, but a refugee, Herzen, published at London a newspaper, the *Kolokol* (Bell),

whose numbers, though prohibited, found their way into Russia by the thousand; Alexander II. himself read them, to keep informed on the abuses of power. It is said that an official denounced in one issue placed before the Tsar a falsified number in which the article was suppressed; some time later the Tsar received from London a letter containing the article with an exposure of the trick.

The *intelligenzia* was agreed in demanding reforms; but on the nature of the reforms they were divided into two camps. The great majority desired liberal institutions like those in Europe, representative assemblies, a constitution, and guarantees of liberty: these were the *westerners*, the liberal party, who predominated at Petersburg. Some, on the other hand, wished to go back to the days before Peter the Great, to suppress the European importations of the eighteenth century, and to restore the institutions of the Russian people in their purity, Orthodoxy and the patriarchal aristocracy. These were the *nationalists*, the patriotic party, formed, during the *régime* of isolation, at Moscow, the old capital, abandoned since the time of Peter the Great. This historic school, essentially Russian, was nevertheless an imitation of the West, a Russian form of romanticism; the old Russia which it wished to restore was an imaginary Russia like the Middle Ages of the romanticists; it took the *boïars* for a national parliament and the *mir* for a primitive free commune.

The two parties began by working together against the officials—the common enemy of every reform. They demanded, besides liberty of the press and of education, a control over the officials and, above all, emancipation of the serfs. Alexander followed their advice. He recalled some of the Siberian exiles, modified the censorship, permitted travel, including trips to other countries, and prepared a scheme for emancipation of the serfs. Without changing his ministers or the political institutions of his empire, he allowed his subjects an amount of freedom beyond precedent.

The Emancipation of the Serfs (1858-63).—The most important measure of the reign was the reform of the land system, coupled with the liberation of the serfs. If we leave out of sight the two extremes of the country,—the north inhabited by landowning peasants, the south studded with foreign colonies or peopled with Cossacks,—almost the whole of historical Russia was held in large estates with serfs as labourers. This system rested on three institutions:

1. The land was held in large estates, partly belonging to the Tsar and the imperial princes, the rest to about 100,000 noble families. The large estates absorbed nine-tenths of the whole arable land of the Empire. Each estate was divided into two parts, the one farmed directly by the owner, the other handed over to a village of peasants in return for a yearly payment.

2. The peasants were attached to the soil by law. As a result they found themselves bound to the proprietor of the land: they paid him dues, performed for him compulsory labour, obeyed him as their master. Their condition was that of mediæval serfs (the Russian word designating them is translated by serf). But the proprietors were not satisfied to act merely as mediæval barons; they used their power, practically unlimited, to transform themselves into *masters* in the old sense. Often they detached the peasant from the land and used him according to their fancy. They sent serfs to establish themselves in towns as artisans, or traders, requiring them to pay a periodical due from their earnings (the *obrok*) and reserving the right to call them home at pleasure. About 2,000,000 of serfs were employed in the personal service of their masters about their residences; their condition was that of ancient slaves. In Russian society of the nineteenth century all the characteristics of Roman slavery reappeared: unbridled brutality on the part of the masters, servile submission on the part of the serfs; the female serfs handed over to the caprice of the master, the men compelled to follow all trades, and avenging themselves by murders and house-burnings (70 at least each year on an average), beaten, mutilated, done to death. The picture is the same in all the descriptions of Russian life.*

3. The part of the estate cultivated by the peasants was not divided up into separate holdings, as in the case of the mediæval serfs. The Russian serf had nothing but his house as an individual possession; it was the village as a whole, the *mir*, that held the land collectively. The woods, the pastures, the streams were used in common; the meadows and plough-lands were distributed in portions, but for a term only, varying in length from two to fifteen years, according to the custom of each region. At the end of the term the whole was returned to the condition of common property and redistributed. The Russians have so little studied their country that this institution had only lately been

*The most striking is that given in Tourguenef's "*Souvenirs d'un Chasseur.*"

made known to the world, and that by a foreigner, Haxthausen; but as soon as known, the *mir* had become one of the favourite institutions of the National party—a venerable relic of ancient Russia, a survival of the collective ownership that was believed to have been the primitive system of the human race.*

This condition of affairs made reform far from easy. Alexander began by consulting the provincial nobles. He wished them to take the initiative, but they preferred to keep their serfs. The Tsar stood firm; he brought together a "committee on the state of the peasantry," which prepared a plan of emancipation. Then the question was officially brought to the attention of the governor of Wilna; the Tsar, speaking as if the nobles of Lithuania were in favour of the reform, authorized them to form committees "to improve the lot of the peasants" (November, 1857). He brought it to the notice of the nobles of the other provinces also, and compelled them, too, to form committees for the discussion of his project.

A declaration, in 1858, laid down the principles of the reform: the peasants should buy out their master's claim to their houses and garden-plots with a sufficient area of farming-land to live upon; the state should aid them to pay. The Tsar set an example by freeing the serfs on the lands belonging to members of the imperial family; these serfs were at once turned into land-owners, subject to an annual payment for forty-nine years (Settlement of 1863).† For the serfs of the ordinary estates, the emancipation, hindered by the passive resistance of the nobles, took more than three years to complete it. The Ukase of February 19, 1861, finally abolished serfdom.

The serfs that had been living detached from the land, domestic servants, and those under the *obrok* were declared free, but without right to property. These came into the condition of the ordinary European day-labourers. The situation of the peasants on the land, much more difficult to regulate, presented three questions for solution:

* It is probable that the *mir* is a recent institution, created, like all other Russian institutions, by order of the Tsar, to facilitate the collection of the taxes by making the villages responsible collectively. It does not clearly appear, in the sources before the sixteenth century, and it was not formerly established in Little Russia. (See Keussler.)

† The peasants on the Tsar's own crown estates had not been treated as serfs, but as farmers under obligation to remain on the crown estates; they were in 1866 made into free farmers on long leases, with the right of buying out the crown's right in their lands.

1. *The Peasant's Right in the Land.*—The nobles, in law the owners of the soil, wished to keep the whole of it. The peasants regarded themselves as the legitimate owners of land which they had cultivated from generation to generation and from which they could not be lawfully evicted. The serfs of a certain village, whose master offered them liberty on condition of leaving the land, replied: "We are yours, but the land is ours." The enfranchisement in the Grand Duchy of Warsaw, in 1807, and in the Baltic provinces from 1816 to 1820, had consisted in declaring the serfs free and the noble the sole owner of the land. The result had been to transform the peasants into needy day-labourers or tenants-at-will. To avoid the creation of a similar agricultural proletariat in Russia, a device was adopted. The peasant-lands were divided into two parts: the landlord kept one, and the other was allotted to the peasants; they got the right to redeem the landlord's interest in it and in the house and garden, but with the consent of the landlord and on payment of a sum sufficient to compensate him for the land and the lost right to services. The state advanced four-fifths of the sum necessary—two thousand five hundred millions in all.* The peasants came under obligation to reimburse the government by paying six per cent. on the sum advanced, for forty-nine years. The portion assigned to each peasant and his share of the debt to the government varied according to the quality of the land.

2. *System of Peasant Proprietors.*—Ought the ownership in the new land-system to be individual or collective? It was the fashion at that time to speak of the danger that the peasants might become mere hired labourers, as in so many Western communities. There was a hope of avoiding this danger by retaining the common ownership of the *mir*. Under the influence of Miliutin it was decided that, in principle, the land should be granted, not to the individual peasant, but to the commune as a body, giving the assembly the right to assign it, by two-thirds vote, as private property, to its members.

3. *Rights of the Nobles over the Peasants.*—The nobles wished to retain the police jurisdiction over their peasants, as in the Baltic provinces. The Tsar preferred to deprive the former masters of all legal authority and to give the police powers to the assemblies of the peasants. The *mir*, formed of the heads of families, presided over by a village elder, decides on the admission of new

* According to Wallace's "Russia" the nobles had, for the most part, to remit the other fifth.—TR.

members, settles the distribution of the land and the taxes; it can inflict corporal punishments and even expel from the commune—a very heavy punishment, for the expelled peasant is driven into distant exile, often to Siberia. The *Volost*, a union of several villages, has an assembly of elected delegates, an elected head and collectors of taxes, and a secretary; it has charge of certain common burdens—roads, schools, and relief of the poor. It has an elective tribunal, which judges in minor cases under customary law, and can sentence to imprisonment or whipping.

The Ukase of 1861 settled the principles of the reform at one stroke; but it gave time for applying them and created special courts for settling disputes as to sharing the lands or fixing the compensations. It was assumed that the redemptions would be completed in twenty years. The process was slower than the forecast. In 1882 there were still a million and a half of peasants who had not redeemed the claims of the nobles. The economic results did not at first correspond to the expectations. The nobles had set too high a valuation on their rights and too low an estimate on the quantity of land necessary to support a peasant. The compensation, fixed at from 8 to 10 rubles for each allotment, exceeded the value of the land; in the central regions the allotments were less than 12 acres; a third of the peasants got less than 8 acres. The people, unable to live on the land assigned, emigrated or went off to work as hired labourers. So a class of agricultural day-labourers came into existence—a result which the *mir* was expected to prevent. But the *mir* is breaking up of its own accord, in proportion as population increases; for land is lacking for the newcomers. In 1882 it was estimated that ten per cent. of the families in the government of Moscow were without land. The compensations paid to the nobles, amounting to 700,000,000 of rubles up to 1890, have not resulted, as was expected, in improving agriculture. The nobles have gone on selling their lands to capitalists whose only object in buying is to cut down the forests for timber.

Meanwhile the emancipation of the serfs has transformed Russian society. By giving the mass of the population equal liberty and the management of their communal affairs it has converted Russia into a modern state. It has prepared her to deliver herself from arbitrary practices, from the servility and sloth that attend slavery, and has brought her the legal conditions that go with private enterprise and orderly public administration. The economic progress of the country showed itself at the end of Alex-

ander II.'s reign by the increased area of cultivation, increased value of land, greater yield of the taxes, increase of export trade, and improved condition of the peasantry.

Alexander II.'s Liberal Reforms.—After this great social reform the Liberals expected a constitution. Alexander refused to grant one. The assembly of the nobles of Tver having asked for "the convocation of a national assembly of deputies from all parts of the Empire," thirteen of its members were arrested. The Tsar carried out a series of limited reforms which must serve to indicate that the scope of his plan was to abolish privileges and class distinctions with a view to consolidating all his subjects into one nation on the basis of equality.

1. Justice had been dispensed by administrative officers with secret and written procedure, in the eighteenth-century manner. It was now remodelled to accord with the nineteenth century. The Tsar decreed, in 1862, that the judicial power should be independent of the administration and reserved for regular courts organized in a gradation of jurisdictions, on the Western model—justices of the peace (sitting singly), sessions of several justices of the peace (as in England), district courts, supreme court, Senate (acting as a court of final appeal). As in other countries, prosecuting attorneys were appointed, a bar instituted, trial by jury for criminal cases established, together with publicity of proceedings and secure tenure for the judges. These reforms had a political bearing: they established equal justice for all, surrounded by guarantees against arbitrary interference. They made the justices of the peace local representatives, for they must be elected by the municipal councils of the cities and by the *Zemstvos*.

2. To make up for the refusal of a voice in the government, the people are called on to take part in the local administration. Self-government was the fashion in Europe at the time: it was represented as the only solid foundation of political liberty. Therefore two grades of local assemblies, or *Zemstvos*, were instituted: one for each district in a province, and a central assembly for the whole province. The *Zemstvo* of the district is composed of deputies elected by the three recognised classes, nobles, city people, and peasants, the first two classes electing their representatives directly, the other class choosing electors to choose for them. The *Zemstvo* of the province is composed of delegates elected by the district assemblies. It holds but one short session yearly; it elects a standing committee for three years. The

assemblies of both grades are to act on "matters connected with the economic interests and needs" of the people: roads, bridges, public buildings, churches and schools, relief of the poor, prisons, public health. They have the right of imposing local taxes.

3. The preventive censorship of books and newspapers was abolished in the two capitals, St. Petersburg and Moscow, in 1865, and was replaced with the system used in France under Napoleon III.—administrative notice in case of objectionable articles and suspension in case of repetition of the offence. In the other cities the old censorship was retained.

4. Public schools on the European model were organized. By the side of the old classical "gymnasium," institutions were founded for giving a modern scientific education, on the model of the German *Realschule*.

5. The army was reorganized on the Prussian model. The twenty-five-year service for a limited number was replaced by obligatory short-term service for all (1873).

The Polish Insurrection of 1863.—The severe measures of Nicholas had not destroyed the Polish nation. The nobles had retired to their estates and lived among their peasantry; they, the women, and the clergy had fostered the national feeling among the rising generation. The Polish exiles were urging Europe to intervene in order to re-establish Poland. The aristocratic exiles gathered about Prince Czartoriski in Paris were counting on the help of the Catholic countries. The young Poles who had joined the democratic parties in various countries were looking for a new European revolution. The national movement extended to the Polish regions of Lithuania, which had been incorporated with Russia proper and were officially known as "the Governments of the North-west."

Alexander II. would have no independent Poland. To the deputies of the nobles at Warsaw he said: "Let us have no idle dreams. Embrace the union with Russia and abandon all thoughts of independence, now and forevermore impossible. All that my father did was rightly done. My reign shall be a continuation of his." But, in practice, Gortschakoff, the new governor, relaxed the severity of the repressive system.

The Polish nobles had been allowed to retain their control in the rural districts. Each in his own domain had the legal ownership of the soil, the charge of police and village administration, together with the right of choosing the priests. The Agro-

nomie Society, founded in 1855, supplied them with a mechanism for acting in concert. It had more than 5000 members. A central committee at Warsaw directed its action.

Alexander II. was at that time expected to make liberal reforms in Poland. One of the leaders of the aristocratic party, the Marquis Wielopolski, at his request submitted reports for his examination; but the government at Petersburg took no further action. The Poles grew tired of waiting and began to make public demonstrations in 1860 and 1861. These were at first mass-meetings, passive and silent, to celebrate the anniversaries of the revolution of 1830. On the occasion of one of these celebrations, under the auspices of the Agronomic Society, the crowd was charged by Russian soldiers. The burial of the victims gave occasion for one more manifestation of popular feeling. The Agronomic Society sent to the Tsar an address claiming the "institutions emanating from national spirit, its traditions and its history."

Alexander, drawn in opposite directions by two parties, wavered between two policies: whether to make liberal concessions and appease the Poles, or to suppress these demonstrations by force. In March, 1861, he granted Poland a separate ministry of education and public worship, to which he appointed the Marquis of Wielopolski, a Pole; he also granted a Council of State and elective provincial assemblies. In April he suppressed the Agronomic Society; a crowd gathered to demand its restoration, and the affair ended in a massacre. Between May, 1861, and June, 1862, the Tsar changed the governor five times, sometimes appointing a friend, sometimes an enemy, to the Poles. The demonstrations continued, notably on the anniversary of the union with Lithuania and the death of Kosciuszko. The mob took refuge in the churches and was driven out by the soldiers. The electors of the provincial assemblies refused to vote, demanding an "elective representation with free discussion."

As in 1830, the malcontents were divided into two parties, the *Whites*, the party of the great landowners, united in the Agronomic Society, and the *Reds*, the democratic party, made up of the students, officers, and young men of Warsaw, directed by a secret central committee. Alexander decided to give the government to Marquis Wielopolski, who accepted Russian domination in order to save Polish self-government; Grand Duke Constantine, the friend of the Liberals, was appointed viceroy. But the Polish patriots wanted to see their country independent. The

Reds regarded Wielopolski as a traitor, and attempted to assassinate him in July and August, 1862. The Whites refused to support him. In response to a proclamation from Constantine, enumerating the reforms to be made, a meeting of the nobility declared it impossible to maintain the government "unless it was a national Polish government, with all the provinces united under free laws." The nobility of Podolia and Lithuania voted addresses demanding union with the Kingdom of Poland.

In order to rid himself of the democratic party, Wielopolski planned to make use of military recruiting. He issued a secret order for levying recruits, not, as was the custom, from among the peasants, but in the cities, and without excepting the students, choosing by preference persons "of ill repute since the late troubles." At Warsaw the young men designated were arrested at night and imprisoned in the citadel. But the majority had been warned in time and had taken refuge in the woods. Thus began the insurrection of 1863.

It was a secret revolt, altogether different from that of 1830. The insurgents had at no time either army, government, or fixed centre. They were not in control of any city, the whole country remaining in the power of the Russian officials and soldiers. But armed bands, formed in the forests, appeared suddenly, made little skirmishes, and finally took refuge on Austrian soil, in Galicia. The secret central committee at Warsaw printed and posted proclamations, gave orders, levied contributions, and bore itself like a government, while the Poles obeyed it without letting the Russian police discover it (it met in the University buildings). This committee first declared itself a provisional government and issued a proclamation against "the foreign government of brigands," promising to the peasants ownership of their land and to the landlords indemnity at the state's expense. All who took part in the war were to receive allotments of land (January, 1863). In March it enjoined the Polish subjects of Austria and Prussia to make no revolt in their provinces, but to "concentrate all the national force against the most terrible enemy, the Russian Tsar." It begged them to send men, arms, and money to the Poles in Russia. It appointed successively two dictators, then proclaimed itself "the national government." Another secret committee, formed at Wilna, called itself the "national government" in Lithuania, declaring the country an inseparable part of Poland (March 31). Then the provinces of the southwest, Volhynia, Podolia, and Ukraine, revolted in May, 1863.

The secret government of Warsaw began to publish newspapers and to give official orders stamped with a seal. It forbade Poles to pay taxes to Russians, to accept partial amnesty, to go to the theatres, sing in churches, or ring bells. It ordered the wearing of mourning, established a compulsory loan and contribution. Its orders were obeyed. In each circle it established a revolutionary tribunal of three members to judge offences against the national cause; the Warsaw tribunal condemned to execution, or rather assassinated, ten Russian agents.

The Poles did not expect to deliver their country through their own efforts, but hoped for the intervention of the European powers. However, Bismarck, who governed Prussia, aided Russia by signing a secret convention closing the Prussian frontier to the insurgents. The Prussian Landtag even accused him of delivering up refugees. The three other great states, France, Austria, and England, arranged to send identical notes to the Russian Government. They urged "six points": 1. amnesty; 2. national legislative representation; 3. national administration by Polish officials; 4. complete religious liberty; 5. Polish as the official language; 6. a regular system of recruiting. Three times the European governments took this collective action in favour of Poland (April, June, and August, 1863). But they were not sufficiently tenacious of their claims to support them with actions. The Russian government simply replied that it was not bound by the treaties of 1815 in the government of Poland and that the insurrection, the work of "the party of disorder," was sustained only by the hope of intervention.

Repression of the Polish National Movement.—In Russia, the Liberals had at first favoured the Poles in their common demand for political liberty. Herzen sided with them, the Petersburg students assisted at a funeral service for the Warsaw victims, and Bakounine formed a volunteer corps. But the little Russian nationalist party of Moscow supported the government against the insurgents. Katkoff, editor of the *Moscow Gazette*, and an enemy to Europeans, attacked the Poles as false to the Slavic brotherhood. He said that in fighting the only state capable of bringing the Slavic idea to triumph they were acting as aristocrats and enemies of the Orthodox religion. The Poles' intention of taking Lithuania again, a partially Russian and Orthodox country, served to excite Russian patriotism. A wave of public opinion, shown by addresses to the Tsar, urged the government to a patriotic and religious crusade against the Poles.

Thus repression took on a Russian and Orthodox character, and was more systematic than in 1832.

It began with the Lithuanian provinces. Mouravief, appointed governor-general of the four Lithuanian governments, in May, 1863, subjected the country to a "military civil administration." In each district an officer, called prefect of war and invested with absolute power, was charged with the supervision of all the authorities, clergy, and landowners; he was to dismiss every officeholder, arrest and send before a council of war every individual suspected of having aided the insurgents or even of not having denounced them. He was to sequester the estates of any who should give assistance to the insurgents or attempt to overthrow the government. Mouravief systematically crushed the Polish aristocracy. He imposed an income tax of 10 per cent. on the estates of the nobility, payable within eight days under penalty of the sale of their personal property. He employed their Orthodox peasants against the Polish Catholic landlords. While he disarmed the whole population he created armed bodies of peasants and sent them in pursuit of insurgents, promising a bounty for each prisoner. He distributed the possessions of insurgent nobles among the peasants, giving preference to those that had distinguished themselves in the campaign of repression. All insurgents taken with arms upon their persons were executed within 24 hours, and mourning for them was forbidden. Landlords were ordered to remain on their estates and were made responsible for every act of insurrection within their domain.

When the insurrection was put down, Mouravief began to Russianize Lithuania. In February, 1864, he declared Russian the only official language; he then closed the Polish bookstores and publishing houses, and forbade the building or repairing of Catholic churches without special permission. Later he ordered that Catholic religious instruction should be given in Russian. The Polish language and the Roman alphabet were forbidden even in private life; it was a crime for a tradesman to answer a customer in Polish. Mouravief was nicknamed by the Poles "the butcher of Wilna"; but the Russian patriots extolled him and established a national holiday in memory of the deliverance of Lithuania and the subjugation of the Polish nobility.

In the southwestern provinces the Russian governors crushed the Polish movement by similar processes, arresting the patriotic

nobles and sending them to Siberia, and replacing native officials with Orthodox Russians. The United Greek Church was turned into the Orthodox Church.

In the Kingdom of Poland, the governor, as military dictator, surrounded Warsaw in September, 1863, and searched all the houses without finding the central committee. He revenged himself by imposing a special contribution and arresting hundreds of suspects. The Poles, despairing of European support, gave up the battle in February, 1864. The members of the committee were found and hanged in August.

The Polish patriots, suspected of sympathy with the insurgents, were arrested in all the Polish districts and transported in a body to Siberia, either as free exiles or condemned to enforced labour in the mines. A "government commission" invested with absolute power was charged with the reorganization of Poland. The head of the commission undertook "to root out Latin civilization and replace it with a true Slavic civilization." All the institutions belonging to Poland were destroyed, and in 1867 the country was divided into 10 governments and 85 districts like the rest of the Empire and with the same administrative system. The governing boards were removed from Warsaw to Petersburg.

Polish patriotism had been shown especially by the nobles, students, and clergy; it was kept up by the Polish language and the Catholic religion, which made the Poles feel themselves a different nation from the Russians. The Russian government wished to exterminate Polish, and made Russian the language of education in the University of Warsaw, the secondary colleges, and the primary schools. It forbade the use of Polish in all administrative acts, then in judicial acts (1876), and finally in the churches, in signs, and in public notices.

In order to weaken the clergy the majority of the monastic bodies were suppressed in 1864. Of 155 monasteries with 1635 monks there remained 25 with 360; of 42 convents with 549 nuns there remained 10 with 140. As the secular clergy could not be destroyed, they were subjected to political supervision and their estates secularized—the Church receiving in return grants of money from the state (1865). The concordat with the Pope was abrogated in 1866 in spite of the remonstrances of Pius IX. The administration of the Catholic Church was handed over to the ecclesiastical college at Petersburg. Orders were given to the United Greek clergy to use the Russian language and suppress

all Roman Catholic rites. Then the Uniate Church of Poland was detached from Rome and made a part of the Orthodox Church.

In order to destroy the power of the nobility in the country, a radical land reform was made in March, 1864. The peasants occupying lands under the crown, clergy, and nobles, were declared *proprietors* of their houses and cattle, and the land of which they had been only tenants. All seigniorial dues and compulsory services were abolished and replaced by an annual tax of considerably less amount—two-thirds of the annual value of the services and four-fifths of the annual dues. The government received the tax and compensated the landowners by an annuity of 5 per cent. for 42 years. The village became a commune administered by the assembly of peasants, a mayor, and a summary tribunal, both elected. The priest and the noble were excluded from the assembly. The nobles lost by this reform about one-half of their income and all rights over their former peasants. The peasants not only became at a stroke independent of their lords, but they received more land and with fewer charges than the Russian peasants. Another measure toward Russification was to forbid Poles to acquire lands in Poland.

It does not appear that the government has succeeded in Russianizing the Polish people. But it has not restored the former institutions, and Poland has remained under a system of martial law, administered without restraint by Russian generals and officials.

Return to Absolutism in Russia.—Alexander II.'s liberal measures had never been sincerely accepted by the officials, accustomed as they were to carry on the administration without publicity or restraint. The Tsar himself had hesitated, and the officials had used every opportunity to return to the former system. In the arrangements for the emancipation of the serfs they had fixed, for the limit of the lots of land and the redemption of the nobles' rights, figures disadvantageous to the peasants; and they delayed the work of redemption. In 1862 a "central committee of revolution" having published a proclamation against the imperial family, and numerous incendiary crimes having startled Petersburg, the government closed the reading clubs and circulating libraries and suspended a number of journals. It arrested Tschernyschewski, a democratic writer, author of the famous novel "What is to be done?" and condemned him to fourteen years of hard labour. A number of young democrats had

organized Sunday-schools for the instruction of poor children; the government closed them.

After the Polish insurrection, the nationalist party began to curse European institutions and to declare the autocratic system the only one that would bring about Russian unity. When the Moscow assembly begged the Tsar to grant a representative constitution, Alexander replied: "The right of initiative belongs to me exclusively and is united inseparably to the autocratic power which God has intrusted to me. . . No one is qualified to come before me with requests concerning the general interests and needs of the state." The *Zemstvos* attempted to busy themselves with local affairs, to control officials and even to express political views. But the government distrusted them, permitting the publication of their deliberations only after review by the governor, forbidding the expression of political views and suspending or closing their sessions. It gave the governor the power to suspend all their decisions when he judged them contrary to the welfare of the state. Thus hampered, the *zemstvo* did not become an institution of *self-government* as had been hoped, but remained subject to the officials.

The judicial reform was to guarantee subjects against despotism and to do away with special and secret tribunals. But on the first occasion for the application of the new system to a political crime, the government flinched. A fanatic named Karakosof had fired upon the Tsar; instead of sending him before the common court, they had him tried secretly before a special commission, according to the old usage. This precedent became the custom; in political cases special commissions are employed, and they judge secretly without guarantee for the accused. This process was regulated in 1871; in every political affair the minister of justice decided whether the accused should be tried by judicial procedure before a jury or by special procedure before a secret commission; he rarely decided in favour of jury trial. Persons accused of political offences had neither publicity nor guarantee. They were seized by the police and kept in prison on suspicion indefinitely, in prisons like those of the eighteenth century, dark, damp, fever-dens, where they lay at the mercy of their jailers. Officials could even dispense with judicial formalities. Russian law did not guarantee free choice of a dwelling place, but gave officials the right to assign a residence to the Tsar's subjects in any part of the Empire, even in Siberia. Russian officials could seize and transport to Siberia by *administrative means* per-

sons of forbidden opinions, sometimes even those who on accusation had been tried and acquitted. Transportation was usually effected by *Kibitka*, springless vans,—whence arose the popular expression “*Kibitka* justice,”—and the family of a suspect often knew not even where he had been taken.*

Liberty of the press was rendered a fallacy in both capitals by warnings and suspensions. The newspapers could publish only what the officials were pleased to let pass; there were left only the official political organs and that of Katkoff, leader of the autocratic party, the *Moscow Gazette*.

Education matters were put in charge of a new Minister of Education, Count Tolstoï, an absolutist (not to be confused with Leo Tolstoï, also a count, the great novelist, of liberal and evangelical opinions). He revolutionized secondary education, suppressing the sciences, which were considered revolutionary, and substituting the ancient languages. In the universities he forbade students' clubs, and when they held an indignation meeting, treated them as insurgents (1869). He finally appointed special inspectors to watch them.

The Opposition Parties.—The gradual return to the absolutist system was a bitter disappointment for the *intelligenzia*. The enthusiasm of the first years of the reign was followed by a profound discontent. An opposition was formed, among young men in particular, which little by little became revolutionary. This evolution, begun in 1861, may be divided into three phases: the critical dissatisfaction of Liberals about 1869, the socialist movement until 1875, and finally revolutionary terrorism.

1. In the years following the reform of 1861 the malcontents were chiefly those who admired European institutions, the liberal aristocratic nobles, young men, and democratic humanitarian students. They would have wished more far-reaching reforms, a European constitution, a representative assembly (which the nobles demanded *officially* in a number of provinces), complete liberty of press and religion. They complained that the reform decrees were not applied. The discontent was at first theoretical and vague, a sort of general discouragement. Then, when the reform turned out a failure, the cultivated Russians, reflecting on the social conditions of their country, found them

* This system of transportation and enforced residence by administrative authority is described by Kennan, the American journalist, who saw it in operation. His book, “*Siberia*,” though little noticed in France, has had great attention in the United States and Europe.

desperate and gave up hope. They did not form an active party, and the secret societies had been paralyzed by the prosecutions of 1862 to 1864; they contented themselves with a pessimistic criticism of society in general. Natural sciences and positivist and materialist philosophy were the fashion of the hour; people dissected frogs and read Buckle, Darwin, and Büchner. Tourguenef described this condition of mind in his novel "Fathers and Children" in 1862. He gave these cynical pessimists the name of *nihilists*.* The name became famous all over Europe, and it is still used as a term of reproach for the Russian revolutionists. The malcontents of this generation were addicted to a very destructive criticism, scoffing at religion, family ties, and government; but they attempted little in the way of action. Karakosof's attempt against the Tsar in 1866 made a great impression; it was the first attempt by a *Russian*. The government replied with a rescript against these dangerous doctrines that were attacking every sacred object, destroying the foundations of the family and property, obedience to the law, and respect for authority. From this rescript dates the definite return to the absolutist system. The malcontents became alarmed and fled the country.

2. In foreign countries the refugees adopted socialistic ideas. These ideas began to enter Russia in two forms: Marxist socialism, represented in particular by Lavroff, and Proudhon's anarchy, adopted by Bakounine. But Bakounine, by adapting Proudhon's doctrine to Russian ideas, wished to transfer the ownership of the soil to the commune (*mir*) and declared that to prepare the way for revolution the people must be roused by acts of violence, riots, and conspiracies. A revolutionist named Netchajew founded a society directed by a secret committee, and persuaded the members that Russia was full of societies ready for action. His heroes were the national brigands, Razin and Pougatchef. The society murdered a spy in 1868, and was discovered and suppressed. But the doctrines continued to spread. Bakounine's motto was "to go among the people," which meant to mingle with the people and excite them to revolt. Lavroff also recommended preparing the people for a peaceful economic revolution by educating them. A proclamation invited the *intelligenzia* to descend among the people. Several groups were formed, composed mainly of students and young girls. Then began a period of obscure acts of self-devotion: the young men

* The word itself was not new, having been used in France before 1848.

became day-labourers or peasants in order to mix with the people. That their white skin might not betray them they exposed their faces to the sun and blackened their hands with tar. They talked with their fellow workmen, secretly printed and distributed propagandist writings. Tourguenef describes in his novel "Virgin Soils" this new generation of agitators, so different from the *nihilists*. These socialists spread over several provinces; but having neither common organization nor uniform tactics, they produced no important results. The government, warned in 1874 by an informer, ordered the prosecution of 770 persons; 265 suspects were held in prison in 1875. The secret societies, recognising the uselessness of peaceful propagandism, sought to influence the peasants by announcing a more equitable division of land. There were several local riots of peasants discontented at having received too small a portion of the village land. Arrests and political prosecutions continued, that of Odessa in 1877 involving 193 accusations. Political prisoners complained of brutal treatment in the prisons. In 1878, a young girl named Vera Sassulitch fired on the chief of police, who was accused of having had prisoners beaten; her case was brought before a jury and she was acquitted.

3. The movement then changed its character, and violent socialists assumed control. They gave up the propagation of doctrine and even the preparations for social revolution; experience had proved that propagandism is impossible under the absolutist system and that Russia has no proletary class to aid a revolution. The malcontents wished first to destroy the absolutist system and force the government to grant a national representation and liberty of the press: social revolution would come later. The Russian revolutionists gave up social agitation provisionally in order to return to the former program of the Liberals; they demanded political liberty. But they employed other resources for advancing their cause; to the governmental terror they wished to oppose a revolutionary *terror*. In May, 1878, remnants of the secret societies of Petersburg and Southern Russia met in a secret society, strongly organized at Petersburg under a directing committee, which ordered and prepared attempts against the authorities. Each member bound himself to the execution of decrees. The party had a very small membership, formed of a number of obscure young men, students, workingmen, and young women, but strongly organized for action, with secret printing establishments, laboratories, and money which they pro-

cured by voluntary gifts or by terror. It began with the murder of several spies. It then attacked the officers of police and administration who arrested or maltreated people of the party. The chief of the "third section" (the political police), who had maltreated persons under arrest, was stabbed in broad daylight. The *terrorists* were fighting a duel with the government. From 1878 to 1882 there were 6 attempts against high officials, 4 against chiefs of police, and 9 spies were killed; 31 revolutionists were executed, 8 died in prison, and 3 committed suicide. The Tsar called on Russian society for aid against the "revolutionary band" in August, 1878. Certain *Zemstvos* answered this appeal by pointing out the vices of the administration and begging the Tsar to grant his subjects "the same liberties as he had gained for the Bulgarians."

The Terrorists decided to kill the Tsar. Four attempts were made against him: a shot, a mine under the railroad over which the imperial train was to pass, an explosion of dynamite in the Winter Palace, finally bombs thrown against his carriage in March, 1881. To oppose the Terrorists, Alexander in 1879 divided the country between 6 governors-general invested with discretionary powers. In 1880 he established a commission for the preservation of order in the state, whose head, Loris Melikoff, enjoyed a sort of dictatorship. Loris Melikoff tried to win the good opinion of the Liberals by pardoning condemned persons, ordering an investigation of the prisons, and forbidding the governors to sentence to transportation by administrative order. Alexander seemed ready to restore the liberal system; he dismissed Count Tolstoï, suppressed the third section, and was about to sign a project for the creation of deliberative assemblies, when he was assassinated. The Terrorist executive committee announced that the death sentence pronounced upon the Tsar, on September 9, 1879, had just been carried out, and called on his successor, Alexander III., to give Russia a liberal system.

Alexander III.'s Reign.—Alexander did not dismiss Loris Melikoff at once. He even seemed to approve the creation of a reform committee. But he was not, like his father, in sympathy with Europe; he was, like Nicholas, a Russian, an Orthodox, and an enemy to Western ideas. He first chose councillors from among those who hated the West: Katkoff, the head of the nationalist party, Pobiédonostsef, proctor of the Holy Synod of the Russian Church, and General Ignatieff. He announced his "faith in the strength and truth of autocratic power," said he

was "called to strengthen and defend the nation's welfare against attack" (manifesto of May 11). And in truth Alexander III. maintained throughout his reign the autocratic system of his grandfather Nicholas. But, unlike Nicholas, he preserved peace with other nations. Ignatieff, who favoured an aggressive policy in Europe, was dismissed in 1882. The Tsar retained only the absolutists, Katkoff and Pobiédonostsef; he recalled Count Tolstoi, who had made himself so famous by his struggle against modern science. As soon as Alexander III. declared his autocratic intentions, the Terrorists reopened their campaign. They prepared an attack for the coronation day at Moscow, but the police discovered it. The Terrorists were few in number and were finally exterminated about 1884. Since then we have read in foreign papers that the police continue to guard the Tsar, and that there have been several unsuccessful attempts and arrests, some, it is said, among the army officers; but we do not know whether the revolutionary party is still organized; the government, if it knows, keeps silence.

The Russian government restored the system of Nicholas I. and laboured to destroy the work of Alexander II. It kept a sharp eye on all institutions through which there was danger of European ideas entering Russia—the press, the schools and colleges, and the local assemblies. The censorship of country papers was so applied as to prevent the publication not only of criticisms, but even of information disagreeable to officials, such as fires, robberies, and deaths. As for the papers in the capitals, the system of warnings reduced them to hardly more than official organs. The organs of the autocratic party alone were permitted freedom of speech, so that to the outside world Russian opinion seemed represented by Katkoff, the enemy of the West and especially of republican France.

A special censorship examined foreign books and newspapers, either excluding them or permitting their entrance only after striking out passages considered dangerous for Russian readers. This operation, performed with an ink-covered roller, was familiarly known as "Knocking out the caviar."

The government tried to develop religious education by creating primary schools, directed by the *popes*. It also tried to exterminate the dissenting religions of the west by converting to Orthodoxy the Lutheran peasants of the Baltic provinces and the Catholic peasants of Poland. It persecuted the religious sect of *Stundists*.

In the universities a number of liberal professors were dismissed or silenced, and the students, always suspected of revolutionary ideas, were subjected to continual supervision, which seems to have provoked frequent trouble, from 1884 to 1890. In Russia, the universities are, as in Europe during the Middle Ages, frequented chiefly by poor young men, sons of *popes*, lower officials, and small Jewish merchants. This intellectual proletariat disturbed the government. The report of the conspiracy of 1887 showed, among the compromised, the names of professors and students of the lower classes. A circular was issued forbidding secondary schools and universities to receive the children of workingmen and domestic servants.

The elective justices of the peace, established by Alexander II., were suppressed. In the rural districts they were replaced in 1889 by new officials, chiefs of the canton, appointed by the government exclusively from the nobility. These officials were charged not only with the administration of justice, but with the appointment and dismissal of the chiefs of the villages, and with the supervision of the village councils. The peasants were thus made subject to the nobles.

No opposition could now be made by lawful methods; but the foreign papers often announced the discovery of plots, secret printing houses, and political societies; they reproduced proclamations issued by the revolutionists, petitions to the Tsar pointing out abuses of power by officials, and protests against the treatment given to political convicts.

Alexander III.'s reign was a period of economic transformation. Financial embarrassment had followed the war of 1877, the settlement of claims under the emancipation of the serfs, and the grain famine. The budget showed great deficits; the paper money, excessive issues of which caused the gold to be sent abroad, had fallen to one-half of its face value. The acknowledged deficit lasted until 1887, when a new Minister of Finance, Vichnegradzky, a *protégé* of Katkoff, turned the deficit into a surplus. He set up against the German industries a protective tariff that was almost prohibitive. He paid the Russian debt, placed partly in Germany, by means of a series of new loans made in France beginning with 1888; the total of the French capital lent to the Russian government was estimated at one or one and a half billion dollars. According to official statistics the revenues of the government increased between 1881 and 1891 from 650,-

000,000 to 891,000,000 rubles, railroad traffic from 42,000,000 tons in 1885 to 67,000,000 in 1890.

Russification.—The attempt at enforced Russification of the western provinces had begun under Nicholas I. Alexander II. at first confined himself to the Polish provinces which threatened to form an independent nation; he seemed to have decided to respect the language and religion of the peoples that asked only for self-government. He put a stop to Nicholas' project of Russification in the Baltic provinces. In Finland he convoked in 1863, for the first time since the conquest, the Diet of the four estates, in order to vote a new tax system. They spoke four languages, the Russian governor in Russian, the nobles and clergy in French, the middle class in Swedish, the peasants in Finnish. But the Slavic party, which had become supreme, finally entangled the Tsar in the struggle against foreign languages and religions.* As early as 1867 the Baltic provinces were ordered to enforce the *Ukase* of 1850, making Russian compulsory. The assemblies of the three provinces protested, invoking the Tsars' promise to maintain their rights, including "the use of German in government and city offices and in the courts." The government replied that the Tsars, while confirming the rights of the Baltic provinces, added the clause "in so far as they are consistent with the general institutions and laws of our Empire," and that the use of a separate language was contrary to the "principles of unity" (1867-70). In reality the measure was not enforced.

Under Alexander III. the government once more attempted Russification. In 1885 the three Baltic governments were ordered to write their communications in Russian. The city councils of Riga and Revel refused, and were prosecuted. The secondary schools were ordered to give Russian the first place in education. The postal system demanded addresses in Russian. At the same time measures were resumed against the Lutheran religion. Children born of a mixed marriage must be brought up in the Orthodox Church. Lutheran peasants, who had been converted to Orthodoxy by the promises of the government and wished to return to their primitive religion, were arrested, and the pastors

*The persecution was extended to the Russian dialects. A popular literature in Lesser-Russian dialect had been built up in the Ukraine. The Russian Government in 1876 forbade the printing of any original work in Lesser-Russian, also the acting, reciting, or singing of any piece in that dialect.

who had performed a religious act for them were prosecuted for attempting to convert an Orthodox believer. To the protests of the Lutheran clergy Pobiédonostsef replied: "Russia's first duty is to protect the Orthodox faith against inward doubts and outward attacks. . . The religions of the West have not yet given up attacking the integrity of the Empire. Russia cannot let them tempt her Orthodox sons." Radical measures were taken at length: orders were given in 1889 to the German schools to adopt the Russian language, orders to replace German with Russian on signboards, and to use Russian alone in all public business. Russian judges replaced the German judges. The University of Dorpat, the centre of intellectual activity in the Baltic provinces, was Russianized. In 1890 it received orders to conduct its courses in Russian.

Meanwhile the government was endeavouring to drive out the Jews. These numbered about 5,000,000, mainly in the western provinces, the former Kingdom of Poland. They had preserved not only their religion, which was still very formal, but also their costume, customs, and language—the latter a German jargon full of Hebraisms. First they were forbidden to enter the liquor trade or to acquire land (1882). The people, excited against the Jews, plundered and burned their houses. To keep the Jews out of the liberal professions, a limit was set to the number of Israelites who could be admitted to the secondary schools and universities, reducing the number from 10 per cent. of the whole to 3 per cent. In 1890 a general measure was adopted. All Jews remaining in the interior of Russia were to emigrate to the western provinces, and in the districts where they were concentrated they were forbidden to own or lease lands, and were forced to remain in the cities, where all the liberal professions were closed to them. In 1891 the Jewish workmen of Moscow were arrested and taken away by soldiers. There were peasant outbreaks against the Jews, and some 300,000 Jews left the country.

The Grand Duchy of Finland was the last country reached by Russification. Alexander II. had continued to convoke the Diet every five years, Alexander III. every three years. The Diet came into conflict with the government over the law establishing the censorship of the press. The Diet refused to pass it and the government imposed it by administrative means, in 1867, in connection with certain changes relating to the schools and the revenue.

But Finland retained her Swedish administration and reorgan-

ized her bank in 1867, her courts in 1868, her church in 1869, her railroads and her schools in 1872, her communal system in 1873, her militia in 1878, her law of civil rights and her poor relief. A *Finnish* party was formed, which gained from the government the establishment of Finnish as an official language, on an equality with Swedish. In 1890 Finland's economic home rule, in relation to money, customs, and transportation, seemed to be threatened; a plan was also made to reform the Finnish penal code on the Russian model. The Diet of 1891 protested against this policy, and the Tsar left to Finland her self-government.

Tsar Nicholas II.—The death of Alexander III. in November, 1894, made no change in Russia's domestic system. His son Nicholas II. has several times declared his desire to continue his father's policy. He said to the delegates from the nobility and cities, in January, 1895: "Let it be known that I shall maintain the autocratic system as firmly as my immortal father." He considered it an "absurd dream" that the "*Zemstvos* could take part in affairs of state." A petition from writers and journalists for the amelioration of the press laws was rejected. Pobiedonostsef remains at the head of the government, in full possession of his influence, and it is said that the decisive argument in the administration of affairs is: "This is how it was done in the time of the late Tsar."

The principal undertaking seems to have been the series of financial operations designed to procure for Russia the quantity of gold necessary for restoring the value of the ruble. The only domestic event has been the coronation ceremony at Moscow in 1896, in which several thousand bystanders were crushed, through the negligence of the police. The masses in memory of the victims of this catastrophe were made the occasion of a great demonstration by the students in Moscow. This was followed by repressive measures. The report to the government on this incident seems to indicate an extensive liberal movement.

In spite of the official declarations and the acts of the government, there is a general impression that the system is nearing a change. The Tsarina, who hitherto has taken no part in public affairs, is a German princess accustomed to Western life, and the purposes which are attributed to the Tsar himself indicate that he does not believe the autocratic system likely to be a lasting one.

BIBLIOGRAPHY.

BIBLIOGRAPHY.—A selected bibliography will be found in **Ramband**, "Hist. de la Russie," 1894 edit.

DOCUMENTS.*—The principal official documents and the history of events in the annuals of the three languages: "Annual Register," "Annuaire de Lesur," and later, "Annuaire des Deux Mondes," "Geschichtskalender" since 1860.

PRINCIPAL WORKS.—**COMPLETE HISTORIES:** The only good one is **Bernhardy**, "Gesch. Russlands u. der Europaeischen Politik," 4 vols., 1863 ("Staatengesch. d. n. Z."), stops at 1831.—**Créange**, "Hist. de la Russie jusqu'à Nos Jours," 1896 edit., a summary popular edition, hardly worth while except for Poland.

EPISODES: Important information in anonymous but well-compiled works: "Von Nicholas I. zu Alexander III." (1881), on the affairs of 1848; "Aus der Petersburger Gesellschaft," 1882; "Russische Wandlungen," 1882, on the reign of Alexander II.—On Nicholas II., **Fr. Schutz**, "Das Heutige Russland," 1897.

DESCRIPTIONS OF RUSSIA: These works, giving much instructive about Russia, where custom holds a more important place in political life than events, may be classified into three periods:

1. Period of Nicholas I.: **Nic. Turguenieff** (not to be confused with the celebrated novelist, Ivan Tourguenef), "La Russie et les Russes," 3 vols., 1847, the work of a Russian.—**Schnitzler**, "L'Empire des Tsars," 4 vols., 1862-69, officious.—**Haxthausen**, "Étude sur les Institutions Nationales de la Russie," trans. from the Germ., 3 vols., 1847-53, famous for the description of the Russian *Mir*.

2. Liberal period of Alexander II.: **Wallace**, "Russia," 2 vols., 1879, trans. into Fr., observations of an Englishman on the working of the new institutions.—**Anat. Leroy-Beaulieu**, "L'Empire des Tsars," 3 vols., 1881-89.

3. Period of Reaction: **Tikhomirov**, "Russie Politique et Sociale," 1886; rich in facts, the work of a revolutionist, later converted.—**Stepniak**, "La Russie Souterraine," 1885, "La Russie sous les Tsars," 2 vols., 1885, "The Russian Peasantry," 1888; the author, whose real name was Kraftchewsky, was an exiled revolutionist. The most instructive romances on Russian life are **Gogol's** "Dead Souls" and **Tourguenef's** novels already mentioned.

ON THE REVOLUTIONARY MOVEMENT: **A. Thun**, "Gesch. der Revolutionären Bewegungen in Russland," 1883, intelligent and well informed, with a good bibliography.—**Oldenberg**, "Der Russische Nihilismus," 1888; for the end.—Bibl. in "Handwörterbuch der Staatswissenschaften" (Anarchismus, Sozialismus), 1890-93.

* Being unacquainted with Russian, I do not quote the Russian documents, but confine myself to French, German, and English works; and further, mentioning only the chief of those, those which suffice for knowledge of the facts, and which give references to incidental writings and monographs. I omit the literature of Polish martyrdom, the political writings of revolutionists, polemic pamphlets and works (Herzen, Dolgoroukov, I. Golovine).

ON THE PEASANT EMANCIPATION: **Anat. Leroy-Beaulieu**, "Un Homme d'État Russe," 1884; study of Miliutine and the drafting of the emancipation project.—**Keussler**, "Zur Gesch. u. Kritik des Bauerlichen Grundbesitzes in Russland," 3 vols., 1876-82; the chief study of the whole, refers to previous works.

ON RUSSIFICATION: **J. v. Dorneth**, "Die Russificierung der Ostseeprovinzen," 1887, and a well-prepared anonymous work, "Deutschprotestantische Kämpfe in den Baltischen Provinzen Russlands," 1888, both from the German standpoint.—For the persecution of the Jews, the publication "Darkest Russia," and **Frederic**, "The New Exodus," 1892.

ON TRANSPORTATION TO SIBERIA: **G. Kennan**, "Siberia and the Exile System," new edit., 2 vols., 1891 (partially trans. into Fr.), the story of an American eyewitness.

ON INSTITUTIONS: **Engelmann**, "Staatsrecht d. K. Russland," 1889 (Marquardsen coll.), description of official institutions; bibliog.—**Lehr**, "Legislation Pénale de la Russie," 1879.—**De Clercq**, "Les Finances de l'Emp. de Russie," 1886.

ON FINLAND: **Schybergson**, "Gesch. Finnlands," 1896, tr. from the Swedish (Gotha coll.), goes as far as 1894, good for official facts.—**Mechelin**, "Staatsrecht Finnlands," 1889 (Marquardsen coll.); "Précis du Droit Public de Finlande," 1886.

ON POLAND: Bibliog. of works in French in **Lorenz**, "Catal. de la Libr. Fr." (analyt. tables, vols. viii. and xi.).—**Chodsko**, "Hist. Popul. de la Pologne," 14th ed., 1864.—**Lisicki**, "Le Marquis Wielopolski," 2 vols., 1880, Polish Conservative, very well informed on the revolution of 1863.—**Ratsch**, "La Russie Lithuanienne," 1869, for the insurrection of 1863.—**Leliwa**, "Russie et Pologne," 1896, for the existing conditions of Poland.

CHAPTER XX.

THE OTTOMAN EMPIRE.*

The Ottoman Empire in 1814.—The Ottoman Empire, founded of old by the family of Ottoman Sultans, whose name it bears, was an absolute military monarchy, established in Asia, and extended by conquest through a whole region of Europe.

Its territory, even after the losses of the eighteenth century, was still very large; it comprised the whole of Asia Minor, as far as Persia, Syria, Egypt; and in Europe the whole of the Balkan Peninsula as far as Austria, and Russia. But its government remained an Oriental, Mussulman despotism, which estranged it more and more from Christian Europe, where the liberal form of government was steadily gaining ground. The Ottoman government also has lived through this century in a constant alternation of crises and attempts at reform.

Like all despotic Oriental states, the Empire had no institution working according to law. The central government was in the hands of a confused combination of the personal will of the Sultan or his favourites, orders from his lieutenant, the *Grand Vizier*, and decisions from the *Divan*, a council of high dignitaries. The army was mainly composed of *janissaries*, stationed in or about Constantinople. These were hereditary soldiers, who were poor fighters, lacking in discipline, and even at times revolting against their master (they had already deposed two Sultans, 1807-08). Finances were but rudely organized, without a budget (the Sultan drew from the treasury at will). There was neither ledger nor audit: the papers were kept in sacks. There was no regular assessment nor systematic collection of taxes. The poll-tax

* This chapter is short; the Asiatic provinces are outside the field of a history of Europe; the interference of European powers in the Eastern question is treated in the chapters on inter-state relations. The history of the independence of the Balkan Christians it has seemed to me best to put in the chapter upon those peoples. There remains here, therefore, only the history of the government of the Sultans in Europe, and their attempts at reform.

(Kharadj) upon all male subjects who were not Mussulmans, the rents on the domain, and the taxes on transportation were farmed out to undertakers who exacted more than their due. Provincial administration was not much more than authorized extortion; the governors took the province at auction, and the officials, receiving no pay, besides being left without supervision, oppressed and tyrannized over the inhabitants.

Being a Mussulman government, the Empire encountered special difficulties in Europe. The Sultan was Caliph, Commander of the Faithful; the Koran was the law—not only religious law, but civil and political as well—for all Mussulmans. It confused the Church and state, allowing the Church to make the laws of the state. The civil power forbade all Mussulmans, under pain of death, to be converted to any other religion. The real Ottoman people comprised only Mussulmans. It was not a nation in the ethnological sense, not even a group united by common language or customs like the nations of Europe. The nationalities that went over to Islam were admitted to equality with their conquerors, even when they retained their own language and national dress. The popular expressions, Turkey, Turkish Empire, are accurate neither politically, for all Mussulmans are *Ottomans*, nor ethnographically, for in *European Turkey*, except about Constantinople, the Mussulman population is not Turkish. (Even in Asiatic Turkey it is a mixture of Turks and converted peoples, Armenians, Greeks, and Syrians.) There are Croats in Bosnia, Albanians in Epirus, Bulgarians (Pomaks) in Macedonia, and Greeks in the islands. Among all these Mussulmans the government made no distinction either in theory or in practice, rank and office being open to all alike. The Mussulman Empire was a truly democratic monarchy.

But as the Mussulmans, unlike the Christians of the Middle Ages, tolerated non-Mussulmans merely as social inferiors, the population in almost all the European provinces found itself composed of two layers, one placed over the other. The old inhabitants, who were still Christians and had become *raïas* (flocks), strangers in the Ottoman state, could not, in principle, either enter the army or any office. The government tolerated them, but shut them out from political life and made money out of them by means of the *Kharadj*. The Mussulmans formed a democracy among themselves, but an aristocracy with regard to the *raïas*. Ottoman society, democratic by its social system, had become aristocratic by its religion. It comprised two classes,

one excluded from political rights, the other in exclusive possession of the power, classes which were necessarily unequal and hostile to each other and unable to blend, because separated by religious hatred. Political inequality had produced social inequality; everywhere the Mussulmans were property holders and lords, the Christians tenants and subjects.

The Christians, in order to defend themselves against the Mussulmans, had secured from the Sultans promises of guarantees for their religion, that is to say, for their clergy and churches. Each Christian society (and the Jews as well) had formed a religious community of sufficiently strong construction to become an actual administrative district. The Ottoman government favoured this organization as facilitating communication with its subjects. In every community the leaders of the clergy, patriarch, metropolitans, bishops,* official representatives of their flocks and responsible to the government, had become the civil authorities, who judged, governed, and in some cases tyrannized over their followers.

In behalf of foreign Christians who had come from Europe, a number of states had at first secured the appointment of consuls as the political heads of their nationalities. Then the Sultan had allowed the protection of foreign consuls to be extended to a part of his Christian subjects. France had acquired the official right of protecting Catholics (who were especially numerous in Asia), Russia secured the right of protecting Orthodox worshippers, which included nearly all the Christians in European Turkey. Thus two European governments were enabled to interfere in the internal affairs of the Empire.

The Sultan, being a Mussulman, could not join the Christian sovereigns of Europe; his states remained outside of Christian international law; he had forced his entrance as an intruder and ran the risk of being expelled by force.

The Empire was thus not only weakened by the lack of organization of its military forces, but its weakness extended especially to its religious constitution. It governed, not a nation, but a group of nations, superposed and irreconcilable, the majority hostile to the very principle of the state, the Mussulman religion. The Christians, the natural enemies of the state, remained organized in national bodies, ready for revolt; they were officially pro-

* In the ancient Byzantine Empire, where each city had its bishop, the Metropolitan, whose title corresponds to that of archbishop in the West, had only a small province.

tected by a great European government which was hostile to the Empire, and free from the restraints of international law.

The Empire, threatened in the eighteenth century by the Austro-Russian coalition, which had already arranged to divide it between them, was saved by the wars between the European powers, which diverted the attention of its Western enemies, and, by the establishment of the English in India, which gave England a direct interest in shutting out the other powers from the road to India. In addition to France, his old ally, the Sultan could count on defence from England, which had become his ally during the Egyptian campaign; Austria, his former enemy, was now busied with Italy and Germany. Russia alone remained hostile, and yet she had abandoned the Empress Catherine's dream of conquering and dismembering Turkey.

Crisis of the Greek Insurrection (1820-27).—When peace was restored in Europe, the *Eastern question* (as it was now called) began to be discussed: What is to become of the Ottoman Empire? The question was subdivided into two: 1. Will the Empire be maintained or dismembered? 2. Are the Sultan's Christian subjects to remain *raïas* or be organized as a nation? Of these two questions the diplomatists, accustomed to consider only the sovereigns, seemed to perceive the first alone. The second slowly commanded attention in spite of the diplomatists. The Greeks and Servians had already urged it on the Congress of Vienna, by demanding a national administration; their petitions had been rejected.

The Ottoman Empire, since 1814, has lived in almost constant agitation, insurrections by the subjects, revolts of the pashas, invasions, negotiations with the European powers, not to mention intrigues in the seraglio. The first great crisis was produced by the Greek insurrection (1820). But, as there were Greeks scattered all over the Empire, they did not at first know distinctly in what part they should begin the revolt, and they made the attempt simultaneously in Epirus, Roumania, and Greece (see p. 650).

In Roumania the uprising was the work of a secret society, an *hetairia*, founded at Odessa, following out the rites prescribed by the secret societies of the period, with secret leaders, several degrees of initiation, a cipher, and a symbolic black flag bearing a phoenix; they talked of restoring the Greek Empire by the aid of Tsar Alexander. The leaders had decided to stir up revolt in Morea; but Ypsilanti, who had friends in Moldavia, preferred to

issue his proclamation at Jassy.* The Roumans were little interested in a Greek rebellion; they left Ypsilanti alone with his "sacred battalion," which was driven into Austria (1821). Karavias surprised the city of Galatz, pillaged the mosques, massacred the garrison and the Mussulmans.

In the Greek countries the revolt was general and accompanied by massacres (see p. 651). It excited such sharp irritation among the Mussulmans that the Sultan had the Greek patriarch hanged, together with three archbishops in their priestly robes, at the gate of the Greek Church, on Easter Sunday. Then, the Greeks of Samos having tried to incite revolt in Chios, the Turks sent an expedition to the latter island. They promised an amnesty, but massacred or enslaved that peaceful people† (1823). This execution and massacre prejudiced Europe against the Turks. The powers were, however, slow in beginning their intervention.

The Sultan asked help from the pasha of Egypt, Mehemet-Ali, who was officially his subject, and who sent him an army under his own son Ibrahim. Greece was invaded and conquered, but saved by the intervention of the European powers, who sent their fleets to Morea (1827) to enforce the departure of Ibrahim, and especially by the Russian invasion of the Ottoman Empire (1828-29). The entrance of the Russian army into Adrianople decided the Sultan to ask for peace. He recognised the independence of the new kingdom of Greece (1829). Since 1820 he had allowed a Servian Christian, Miloch, to become hereditary prince of the Servians in the province of Belgrade (see p. 658). This was the first break in the Ottoman Empire.

In order to make peace with the Tsar (September, 1829) the Sultan promised to open to foreign commerce the straits which gave access to the Black Sea (Bosporus and Dardanelles); he undertook to destroy all his fortifications on the left bank of the Danube, which meant the military abandonment of the whole of Roumania; he promised to reimburse Russia for its expenses in

* This proclamation is full of classic references: "Let us place ourselves between Marathon and Thermopylæ. . . The blood of tyrants will be an agreeable expiation to the souls of Epaminondas, Thrasybulus, Miltiades, and Leonidas. The Turks, these effeminate descendants of Darius and Xerxes, will be much easier to conquer than the Persians of old times."

† I pass rapidly over these events, which though highly picturesque and dramatic, and celebrated by the greatest poets of the century, are of little political importance. On the independence of Greece, see p. 652; on the intervention of Europe, see chap. xxv.

the war, which made him dependent on the Russian government, for he had no money and, as time went on, he was obliged to replace his payments by political concessions.

Mahmoud's Reforms (1826-38).—Mahmoud, who had been Sultan since 1808, wished, like Peter the Great, to reform his empire on the European model. This admiration for Europe had been handed down to him, it was said, by his uncle Selim (1788-1807), who had fallen a victim to it, for he was deposed for having wished to reform the janissaries.

Mahmoud began with the army. During the war with Greece he announced (May, 1826) the formation of a troop to be trained by Arabs. He proposed, not to introduce new schemes, but to restore the ancient Ottoman tradition (Solyman's regulations), which had been unduly abandoned. He ordered the janissaries to furnish some of the men for his new army. The janissaries mutinied. Mahmoud, supported by other bodies, ordered a discharge of cannon on the janissaries' barracks, at the same time, it is said, ordering the back gates to be opened as a means of escape. The most unruly of them were massacred, and the Sultan declared the janissaries abolished (1826). Later he abolished the other ancient bodies of *spahis* and armorers.

A new army was then formed, with European dress and discipline, numbering 70,000 men. A Prussian officer, von Moltke, who later became so famous, had an active part in this organization, and has given a satirical description of it in his Letters: "The reform consisted chiefly in externals, names, and trappings. The army was built on the European plan, with Russian tunics, a French code, Belgian guns, Turkish turbans, Hungarian saddles, English sabres, drill-sergeants of every nation, an army composed of *timariotes*, of soldiers for life, of a *landwehr* without fixed terms of service, in which the leaders were recruits, and the recruits enemies of the day before."

Mahmoud also aspired, like Peter the Great, to reform the manners of his empire on the European model. He drank wine, in spite of the Koran, and liked to see his high officials tipsy. He dressed like an Egyptian, in short clothes, with a short-cut beard, and settled the cut and material of the clothing of his courtiers. He even made an ordinance (1837) on the length of the mustache, and ordered, contrary to custom, that the beard should be cut an inch from the chin.

Mahmoud broke up that sort of official aristocracy which, at the court and in the provinces, was beginning to form a class

of hereditary office-holders. He disturbed the Divan by introducing the custom of deciding matters with each minister individually. He intimidated the body of *ulemas* (at once theologians and judges) to prevent its making any open opposition to his reforms. But for the reconstruction of regular institutions he could not find sufficiently well-educated helpers among the Mussulmans * and he could not avail himself of the services of Europeans, who were despised as Christians. He did not succeed in reforming the financial system. His imitation of Europe was only superficial and had no effect, except on the army.

Crisis of the Egyptian Conflict (1833-40).—While these reforms were on foot, the Ottoman Empire underwent a new crisis. Mehemet-Ali, governor of Egypt, after aiding the Sultan against the Greeks, had become embroiled with the Ottoman government, headed by the grand vizier Chosrew Pasha, his personal enemy.

Mehemet claimed first of all the government of Syria, which the Sultan had promised him in return for his assistance. After waiting three years he determined to occupy it by force (1831), while still acknowledging himself subject to the Sultan, to whom he offered a large sum of money, at the same time demanding investiture. His enemies at court, however, persuaded Mahmoud to declare him a rebel. Then his army, which was in control of Syria, invaded Asia Minor and marched on Constantinople. Mahmoud became alarmed and asked help from the Tsar, who, as protector of the Ottoman Empire, sent 15,000 Russians to camp before Constantinople and defend it. In exchange he secured the treaty of Unkiar-Skelessi (1833), which, under guise of an alliance, established a Russian protectorate. Russia promised to bring aid to the Sultan, who in return opened the straits to the Russian navy. France, which supported Mehemet-Ali, secured for him a grant of the government of Syria.

* "It is almost impossible," says von Moltke, "for a European to realize the state of Eastern intelligence. . . . A Turk who can read and write poses as a scholar." He tells how one of the best educated dignitaries could not believe that the earth was round. No one, with the exception of the Christian renegades, speaks a foreign language. For the rest, von Moltke recognises the progress in their manners. "That the Sultan has dared to dismiss a man like Chosrew, who has raised 32 of his slaves to the rank of pasha, without bringing his head to the block, is a proof of Turkish progress, for that would formerly have been impossible" (1836). It was also a mark of progress that when the Sultan's daughter brought a son into the world the child was not strangled; it was simply announced that he had died a natural death, as has been done ever since in like cases.

Mehemet represented himself always as a faithful servant of the Sultan,* who wished not to destroy the Ottoman Empire, but to consolidate it by dismissing the bad ministers and taking their place in the master's favour. In the East, as formerly in Europe, resistance to the sovereign's agents did not mean revolt against the sovereign. But the European powers regarded the question differently; they looked upon Mehemet as an independent sovereign, the Sultan's rival, and an enemy to the Ottoman Empire. They prepared to stop him.

After the death of Mahmoud, Chosrew, on his return from an expedition against the Kurds, thought himself strong enough to take back Syria from Mehemet, but his army was put to rout (1839). This was a renewal of the war of 1833. The Egyptian army crossed Asia Minor and marched on Constantinople. But this time the English government interfered, and induced the other powers, against the wish of France, to impose terms of peace upon Mehemet and even insist upon his resigning Syria (1840). Then, to deprive Russia of her monopoly in protecting the Sultan, it secured the Straits Convention (1841), which closed the two straits to all European fleets.

The crisis had effected the consolidation of the Ottoman Empire.

The Reforms of Reschid Pasha (1838-50).—Mahmoud died before the Egyptian crisis was over (1838). His successor, Abdul-Medjid, left the government to his ministers. The head minister, Reschid Pasha, had formerly been ambassador to England and had learned there the force of public opinion. He tried to introduce European institutions, and, to win favour in Europe, he had them announced by a solemn act copied from the European charters.

The *hatti-sherif* of November 3, 1839, was promulgated at Guh-lane (one of the Sultan's gardens), in the presence of great dignitaries, deputies from the *raïa* peoples (Greeks, Armenians,

* According to Prokesch-Osten, an Austrian diplomat, Mehemet said as early as 1829 to an English agent who had come to offer him a chance to make himself independent: "You are a stranger, you do not know a Mussulman's way of thinking. . . Do you know what the breaking up of the Empire would mean to me? Every Mussulman would start from me with horror, my own son would be the first to desert me. The Sultan is insane, but God has given him to us for our sins." In 1833 he is said to have remarked to Europeans in Alexandria: "I wish to remain the Sultan's servant. . . Ibrahim, if he reached the Bosphorus, would throw himself at the Sultan's feet, ask his pardon and permission to return to Egypt."

Catholics, Jews), and the European diplomatic corps, with a solemn ceremonial, a salute of 101 guns, a prayer, and an astrologer to watch the propitious moment for the reading. The *hatti-sherif* was a sort of constitutional charter, given by the Sultan to his subjects, to all his subjects without religious distinction. The Sultan commended old customs, declared that trouble had come from abandoning them, and so proclaimed new institutions. This contradiction was inherent in the situation of a reformer among a people attached to religious tradition. These national institutions were to guarantee to subjects of every religion security of life, honour, and fortune. The Sultan promised to abolish tax-farming, confiscation, and monopolies.

Recognising in the *raïas* the same private rights that the Mussulmans enjoyed was a revolution. The *hatti-sherif* confined itself, however, to promises. Reschid laboured to introduce its measures into practice. A number of European institutions had already been adopted, lighthouses on the Bosphorus, a hospital, and a quarantine; a ministerial council had been established to make the central government more regular. Reschid tried to reform the financial system. By means of commercial treaties he got the European governments to renounce the maximum tariff which had formerly been stipulated, and in return he abolished the complicated system of variable rates of internal transportation, replacing it with a single tariff of 9 per cent. on foreign merchandise. This facilitated trade with Europe. Within the Empire he abolished tax-farming, and ordered that the poll tax should be apportioned and levied by districts and paid over to receivers.

These reforms irritated the Mussulmans, who favoured the old *régime*, the "Old Turk" party, who sought to turn the Sultan against his ministry. Abdul-Medjid wavered between the Old Turks and the reformers. This contest was complicated by a struggle for influence between the two rival European powers, England and Russia, which had each its special party in the Sultan's court. Reschid supported England, Riza supported Russia. Several times Reschid was dismissed, then recalled. Riza also attempted a number of reforms. While Reschid and Riza were contending, the officials, left to their own devices, restored the old system of tax-farming and collection by military governors.

Reschid had regard for the good opinion of Europe, especially of England. "I agree," he said in 1846, "that our government

is still far from good. But we prevent its being worse." Abdul-Medjid himself seemed to be interested in reforms. He read in public a decree, drawn up by his own hand, in which he declared himself very regretful that his projects had not produced the desired result and announced the establishment of schools to instil in his subjects the principles of science and industry (1845).

These confused reforms, interrupted by reactions—these creations which, for the most part, remained only promises—did not lead to a very profound reorganization of the Empire. The only lasting institution was the army, recruited by the European system of conscription. It was divided into two parts, the active army (*Nizam*), with a five-year service, and the reserve (*Redif*), with a seven-year term, organized in five local army corps, and supplied with European arms. As before it was composed only of Mussulmans. It was an army of good soldiers, brave and steady, but commanded by incompetent officers.

Reschid decreed a complete reorganization of the administration. The hitherto general power of the governor of the province was divided among three distinct officials, a military governor, a civil administrator (*vali*), and a receiver of taxes. Thus were established three services, each with a minister at its head, as in Europe. Reschid had hoped to make the *vali* the principal officer by putting the police under his control, and tried to control him by establishing provincial councils of notables; but these councils hindered reform. Judicial reorganization was confined to a number of mixed courts, composed of Mussulmans and Europeans, with a written procedure. Financial reform was abandoned for lack of honest agents, and taxes and customs duties were again farmed out. The state schools which had been announced were not established. The bank which Reschid had attempted to found was replaced by the *Ottoman Bank*, managed by Europeans.

This was, however, a period of relative prosperity and peace (except for the insurrection of the Christians in Crete in 1841). The government became less harsh, and torture and confiscation disappeared.

Period of the Crimean War (1852-59).—The attempt at reorganization on the European model had given the European governments the hope of settling the Eastern Question by the transformation of the Ottoman Empire into a modern state. Tsar Nicholas, however, did not accept this solution. As early as

1844, in his visit to England, he had said: "There are in my Cabinet two opinions on Turkey; one that she is dying, the other that she is already dead. In either case nothing will prevent her speedy end." In 1852 he said to the English ambassador that "they ought to agree about the funeral." The English government preferred to maintain the Ottoman Empire by checking the Tsar, and succeeded in forming a league with Napoleon III. and the King of Sardinia. (See chap. xxvii.)

The conflict was complicated by the quarrel between the Catholic monks, who were under France's protection, and the Greek monks, who were under that of Russia. They were disputing over the possession of the keys of the Holy Places in Palestine (Bethlehem and the Holy Sepulchre). After long negotiation the Tsar brought his army into Moldavia, declaring that he came to protect the Orthodox Church. This was the beginning of the war (for the history of it, see chap. xxvii.). But the European armies defended the Ottoman Empire and carried the war into the Crimea.

At the Congress of Paris (1856) the European powers, considering the Empire necessary to the balance of power, declared the integrity of Ottoman territory guaranteed; but in return they imposed on the Sultan certain concessions.

Napoleon secured autonomy for Moldavia and Walachia. This was the second break in the Empire.

Even in the interior of the Empire the powers, which had hitherto had confidence in the credit of the Ottoman government, demanded pledges for the making of various long-promised reforms. The Sultan promulgated a reform edict (*hatti-humayoun*, February, 1856) and communicated it to the other governments, who replied: "The contracting powers appreciate the high value of this communication. It is well understood that it could not in any case give the said powers the right to interfere, either collectively or separately, in the relations of the Sultan with his subjects, nor in the internal administration of the Empire."

The *hatti-humayoun* did not proclaim the principle of personal security simply, as in 1839, but also of liberty and legal equality for all Ottoman subjects without distinction of religion. All legal difference between Mussulmans and Christians was suppressed. Christians should be admitted to every military rank and to every office, they should no longer pay the poll-tax, they should be represented in the provincial councils. The Ottoman

Empire would thereby lose its religious character. But the full promise could not be secured. The English government wished to have the death penalty abolished in the case of a Mussulman converted to another religion. European indignation was aroused by the case of a young Christian who had become a Mussulman in a moment of anger and was later put to death on reverting to his own religion. The Ottoman government replied that it could give its word that the penalty would not be enforced again, but that to proclaim it in a public act would provoke an outburst of fanaticism. England had to be content with an ambiguous article. "All religious creeds shall be freely practised; no Ottoman subject shall be hindered or disturbed in the exercise of his religion, or constrained to change it."

Attempts at Reform, Fuad and Ali (1859-71).—The *hatti-humayoun* promised radical reform, a lay state, in which Christians would be protected by law; but as the Mussulman system gave them no protection, to make them equal with Mussulmans would have involved a struggle which the Ottoman government dared not face. On the other hand, the European powers had acted upon this promise and kept watch over the government to insist upon its being kept. The Sultan found himself in a tight place, between his subjects, who did not want the reform, and the foreign powers, who insisted upon it.

The Christian subjects themselves distrusted the reform. Their leaders, patriarchs and bishops, were fearful of losing their power over the faithful, for the government, after declaring all its subjects equal, had drawn from that the conclusion that the privileges of religious communities must be abolished, or at least revised. The Christians held to their privileges; a common system represented to their minds simply the absence of special protection, and that meant to be given defenceless into the hands of the Mussulmans. They were unwilling to serve in the army, preferring to make a money payment; the poll-tax was restored in the form of a tax for exemption from military service.

The Mussulmans, accustomed to despise unbelievers, were unwilling to obey them, either as military or civil officers. The government announced a judicial reform. Justice was to be separated from the administration, and administered by mixed courts chosen by notables, where Christians would be allowed to testify as well as Mussulmans, where judgment would be based on modern codes, with public sittings and a regular procedure. All Turkey knew that this reform could not be applied. It was

not applied, and the Christian mountaineers of Herzegovina, supported by their neighbours in Montenegro, finally revolted; * an army had to be sent to subdue them (1860-61).

The governments of Europe officially expressed their regret that the Ottoman Empire "was not proceeding to a gradual and sustained application of reforms" (1859), and Russia proposed an investigation into the condition of the Christians. But their attention was either distracted by Italian affairs or absorbed by the massacre of Christians in Libanus. In 1861 Abdul-Medjid died, and the new Sultan, Abdul-Aziz, left the government to Fuad and Ali, two favourites, acknowledged reformers. Their sway, however, was at times interrupted. (It was said that once he offered the government to a dancing dervish.)

The leading reform was an attempt to keep the promise made in 1856 by separating justice from the general administration (1864). In each of the administrative subdivisions, *vilayet* (government), *sandjak* (department), *kaza* (district), a tribunal and council of notables were established, naturally composed chiefly of Mussulmans, for the lists were prepared by Mussulmans.

In Crete, where the population is mainly Greek and Christian, and partly composed of armed mountaineers, the discontent took the form of a general insurrection (there had already been one in 1841). The Greek patriots in the Kingdom of Greece laboured to bring back Crete into the Hellenic union. A Cretan committee established at Athens kept in touch with the people of the island. In 1866 the Christians formed a committee, which presented a petition to the Sultan, denouncing the abuse of power by the governors and Mussulmans, and claiming personal and property rights. The government refused to do them justice, and the whole Christian population rose in revolt (May, 1866). The general assembly of Cretans decreed Ottoman rule abolished and Crete "united indissolubly to her mother, Greece" (September). The insurgents occupied the whole island, except the strongholds in the north, where the Mussulmans had taken refuge. Arms and volunteers came from Greece to aid them, but the European powers, whose help they asked, refused to inter-

* The petition sent by the Christians to the European consuls at Mostar shows their usual grievances: "We want permission to build churches, to place bells in them and ring them, we want a bishop of our own race to direct our religious affairs, we want schools, we want to have taxes established in a fixed sum for each house, and we do not want to have Zaptiehs (gendarmes) lodged in our houses."

vene. When the Turkish army, of 30,000 men at the least, took the offensive (October, 1866), the insurgents were quickly driven back into the mountains, where the people of Sphakia held out until 1868. The Greeks in Epirus and Thessaly attempted a revolt, but failed.

The investigation made by the powers, in 1867, showed that the equality promised in 1856 had not been realized. The admission of Christians to office was imaginary; they were accepted only in subordinate positions. These officers had no influence, and were detested by the Christians of other creeds. Mixed courts were very rare, and besides Christians had not the courage to sit in them. A Christian could not obtain justice against a Mussulman, as his testimony was not listened to; the only way for him to get justice done him was to bribe two Mussulman witnesses. In the army the Christians were unwilling to serve with Mussulmans and the Mussulmans were unwilling to obey unbelievers; the army therefore remained Mussulman. Public procedure in the courts remained a figment of the imagination, for police guarded the entrance to the hall. The prisons were horrible, and the police (*saptiehs*) were recruited from the criminal classes. The tax-farming which the reformers had worked so hard to abolish had been restored; the budget was illusory, control of the Court of Accounts amounted to nothing, "boodlers" were not prosecuted, the Supreme Council of Justice had met only once. The only institutions that were respected were the privileges of religious communities, and the powers of patriarchs, including their abuse of power, because these were old institutions.

Europe accordingly protested against the failure to execute the *hatti-humayoun* of 1856. A struggle for influence ensued between France and Russia, to determine what reforms should be made. France proposed the *fusion* of races, that is, to suppress all "distinction between the various nationalities," to establish civil equality and uniform administration as in France, so as to form a single Ottoman nation. Russia had already declared herself opposed to an "incoherent fusion of the Ottoman peoples"; she demanded for each "special guarantees based on religious and communal institutions adapted to the nationalist principle." "Equality before the law will never be realized in Turkey so long as Turks are Turks; that is, until they forswear the Koran, which traces an ineffaceable line between them and the Christians." Russia's advice was to "separate Christian and Mussul-

man interests by granting parallel and progressive development to all nationalities and creeds under the Sultan, in accordance with the exigencies of European balance of power"; this meant to make every Christian nationality a little self-governing state. France's advice was that of a friend, kindly but impracticable; Russia's scheme was practicable but dangerous, for the autonomy of hostile races was the same as dismemberment.

The Ottoman government at first followed France's advice; it attempted fusion and tried to improve its administrative staff by giving its young men a European education. The French College of Galata, a suburb of Constantinople, was founded at this time. But the two reform ministers died, Fuad in 1869, Ali in 1871. The defeat of France by Germany put an end to her influence over the Sultan, and destroyed the European concert which was protecting the Ottoman Empire against Russia.

Financial Crisis and Young Turkey (1871-76).—After 1871 the disorder increased. The deficit became so large (112,000,000 in 1875) and money so scarce that the government became partially bankrupt. It declared itself able to pay only a half of the interest on the debt. Taxes grew heavier and discontent increased, until at length the Christian Serbs in Herzegovina, excited by their Montenegrin neighbours, and possibly by emissaries from Servia and Russia, refused to perform the *corvée* and rose in rebellion (1875). The European powers, being busy at the time with their own domestic affairs, took little interest in the Ottoman Empire.

The Turkish government, to calm the malcontents, issued a new reform edict (1875), once more announcing the admission of all subjects to office, abolition of tax-farming, judicial reorganization, and a council to supervise the execution of the reforms. But the states of Europe had lost their faith in promises. They replied with a collective note, named after Andrassy, the Austrian minister: "The powers feel that there exists a strict unity of interest between Europe and Turkey and the insurgents; they hold that reform must be adopted to put a stop to a disastrous and bloody contest" (December 30, 1875). It was therefore necessary "that Christianity should be put on the same footing with Islamism, in theory and practice . . . that tax-farming should be abolished once for all." It was not necessary "that the execution of reforms should be left to the discretion of pashas; a *controlling board* should be established, made up of Christians and Mussulmans." This time the Empire's protectors were not

content with promises, but demanded guarantees and control. The Turkish government refused.

The insurrection in Herzegovina became a real war. Later the Bulgarian peasants, excited by a committee, made a slight attempt at revolt (May, 1876). At the same time, in Salonica, the Mussulman mob assassinated the French and English consuls.

Then came a new sort of crisis in Turkey. For some years there had been increasing dissatisfaction with Sultan Abdul-Aziz and his extravagances. He was said to be insane. Among the Mussulmans, mainly of the younger generation, had sprung up a party, *Young Turkey*, demanding a constitution. As early as 1868 Kereddin held that according to the tradition of Solyman, *ulemas* and ministers had the right to remonstrate with the Sultan, and, if he should persist in violating the law and following out his caprices, the right to depose him. A manifesto issued by Mussulman patriots to the foreign powers (March, 1876) said: "If instead of a despot Turkey possessed a wise monarch who would lean on a consulting Chamber composed of representatives from all our races and religions, she would be saved. That is the true solution, and it is not contrary to the Koran; the Turkish government is elective."

Young Turkey profited by the excitement following the Bulgarian insurrection. The theological students (*softas*) came *en masse* before the palace. The Sultan sent to ask what they wanted. "We want nothing," they said, "but the reigning government is good for nothing." The Sultan was alarmed, immediately dismissed his grand vizier (May 18), then took as his minister one of the leaders of *Young Turkey*, Midhat-Pasha (May 19). This was the minister who made terms with the guardian of the faith, the *Scheik-ul-Islam*, getting from him a decision declaring the Sultan incapable of carrying on the government. Abdul-Aziz was deposed (March 30, 1876), and immediately after it was announced that he had killed himself. His nephew, Mourad V., was proclaimed his successor, but very soon became insane. He was deposed and replaced by Abdul-Hamid (August 31, 1876). Midhat governed in the name of the Sultan.

Midhat had to reply to Europe's demand in behalf of the Christians of Herzegovina, that a commission be sent to make reforms under the supervision of the European consuls. Then he had to fight the Bulgarian insurgents. As the regular army was busy in Herzegovina, bands of irregulars, half brigands (Bashi-

Bazouks), were turned on Bulgaria; they amused themselves with burning the villages, massacring the men, and carrying off the women. (According to the American consul 100 villages were destroyed, from 25,000 to 40,000 inhabitants massacred, and 12,000 women carried away; the English consul reduced these figures to 68 villages and 12,000 to 15,000 inhabitants.) Europe rose in horror. The assassination of the consuls at Salonica and the Bulgarian atrocities, as Gladstone called them, completed the turn of public opinion against the Turks. The governments dared not interfere in favour of the Ottoman Empire.

Servia, upheld by Russia, openly entered the war in July, 1876, invoking "Panslavism." The Sultan's government could not pay the interest on even the debt to which it had reduced its creditors. The powers began to regard the Ottoman Empire as a minor incapable of taking care of itself; they determined to take it under their guardianship. They began by imposing on it an armistice with the conquered Servians. They then held a conference at Constantinople and finally drew up the Berlin Memorandum—a schedule of reforms *to be imposed* on the Sultan, England not assenting thereto.

Young Turkey, to avoid this European guardianship, had dreamed of transforming the absolutist empire into a constitutional monarchy. The Ottoman nation, putting an end to the Sultan's arbitrary rule, was to take charge of its own affairs; it would be able at once to reorganize the country and make it needless for foreign powers to interfere. It is hard to tell whether the authors of this scheme really thought the constitutional system would prevent the fall of the Ottoman Empire, or were simply acting out a comedy for the entertainment of Europe, in order to get rid of foreign intervention.

The constitution, drafted in secret by a committee of officials and *ulemas*, was promulgated unexpectedly, but with solemn ceremony, in December, 1876. It was a European form of constitution, with a responsible *Council of Ministers*, a *General Assembly* of two Chambers, a *Senate* and an elective *Chamber of Deputies*, liberty of the press and of public meeting, permanent judges, and even compulsory primary education. Islamism remained the state religion. In laying this constitution before the powers, care was taken to point out its lack of theocratic tendencies, "that it established in the Empire the reign of liberty, justice, and equality, and the triumph of civilization," and above all

that "the constitution was not a promise, but a real and formal act which has become the property of all Ottoman subjects." Consequently, when the powers presented their reform ultimatum, a great council, composed of high officials, replied that these demands were contrary to the constitution (January, 1877).

Russian Invasion, Crisis and Dismemberment (1877-78).—*Young Turkey's* reign was short; Midhat-Pasha, grand-vizier and head of the government, suddenly fell (February, 1877). The Chamber, which was made up principally of Mussulmans, creatures of the governors, served only to reject the demands of Europe. (The deputies were known by a name already old in the East: *Evet Effendim*, the Yes, Sirs.)

Europe had ceased to believe in reforms made by Mussulmans; all, even England, accepted the scheme proposed by Russia, the autonomy of the Christian nationalities and supervision by European agents. The conference of Constantinople (March, 1877) declared that "the powers propose to observe through their ambassadors the manner in which the promises of the government shall be executed," and that "if their hope were again deceived, they would consider measures in common." Europe was abandoning the Ottoman Empire.

Russia took up again the plan arrested in 1854 by Europe. The Tsar declared war, this time not in the name of religion as in 1854, but in the interests of Russia and of Europe disturbed by agitations of oppressed Christians. This was a repetition of the war of 1828-29. The Russian army, aided by the Roumanian army, finally arrived at Adrianople and forced the Sultan to accept peace on the terms dictated by Russia (Peace of San Stefano, 1878. On the Russo-Turkish war, see chap xxviii.).

Russia demanded the separation of all the Christian countries, except those occupied by the Greeks (Thessaly, Crete), in which she was not interested. The Sultan renounced his sovereignty over all the Christian peoples who were still tributary to him (Roumania, Servia, Montenegro), and granted them their territory. He recognised a new Christian state, Bulgaria, composed of the country on both sides of the Balkans and Macedonia. This was a definite dismemberment. The Empire retained only three scattered bits in Europe: 1. Roumelia; 2. the peninsula of Salonica, Thessaly, Epirus, and Albania; 3. Bosnia, and Herzegovina, where the Christians were to have an independent administration.

The other European governments found this dismemberment

too favourable to Russia, and the Congress of Berlin adopted another. The three Christian states, Roumania, Servia, and Montenegro, became sovereign states, with increased territory. They cut down the share of the two states specially protected by Russia, Montenegro, and more particularly Bulgaria (see p. 665). To make up for this, they asked Austria to *occupy* Bosnia and Herzegovina for the purpose of restoring order there, without fixing the limit of time for the occupation. France and Italy secured a promise of an enlargement for Greece; but a change of the diplomatic situation came near to making the promise worthless. It was only after long negotiation that Greece succeeded in obtaining from the Ottoman government Thessaly and a bit of Epirus (1881).

The Empire now held in Europe only the Mussulman provinces of Roumelia (*vilayets* of Constantinople and Adrianople), Albania and Epirus, and the Christian province of Macedonia.

Personal Government of Abdul-Hamid.—The crisis of 1878 left the Ottoman Empire heavily involved. It had to arrange terms of evacuation with Russia and a war indemnity; the Empire, for the lack of money, remained in debt to Russia. It had to arrange with Austria for the situation of Bosnia; technically the Sultan remained sovereign over it, but he recognised Austria's right to organize the province as she wished, with the promise to respect religious freedom. In reality Bosnia was not only occupied by the Austrian army, but governed, under the direction of the common minister of finance of Austria-Hungary, by a resident governor and a "government" composed of Austrian officials. The Sultan had also to negotiate with his creditors; the principal of the debt was reduced and the customs revenue was pledged as security, to be administered by a European commission (1881).

The Albanian Mussulmans in the territory ceded to the Christians made armed resistance to the Sultan's orders. They even formed an "Upper-Albanian League" (1878) which attacked Montenegro and had to be put down by force (1881).

Abdul-Hamid at first wavered between contradictory influences. He took as grand-vizier a *protégé* of France, Khereddin, formerly a minister of Tunis, who announced a number of reforms; the Sultan dismissed him when he demanded the right to choose the ministers (1879). He let England propose a plan of reforms which were never carried out (1880). Then he himself took charge of the government at the head of the ministry. The

official Divan still existed, but the real control of the government passed into the hands of the Sultan, who adopted the custom of settling matters in personal consultation with his favourites. At length, overburdened with suspicions of conspiracies, Abdul-Hamid shut himself up in his "Kiosque," surrounded by a large guard, the *hamidies*, composed of Kurds, Syrians, and Albanians, and showed himself to his subjects only on rare occasions. The Ottoman Empire was subjected to the personal government of a painstaking but ill-informed sovereign.

Abdul-Hamid seemed to wish to act as religious head of all the Mussulmans; he sought the society of holy persons and encouraged the preaching of *hadjis* (pilgrims from Mecca). He was even supposed to be thinking of *Panislamism*, as a cry to unite all the faithful under the direction of the Sultan. He had dismissed the advocates of European institutions, the authors of the revolution of 1876, and had Midhat-Pasha condemned as the murderer of Abdul-Aziz. *Young Turkey*, taking refuge in foreign lands, became a revolutionary opposition party, trying to prevail on Europe to depose Abdul-Hamid.

Abdul-Hamid meanwhile left himself to the guidance of England in his choice of officers and, though the reforms had failed, succeeded in establishing a tolerable administration in his Asiatic provinces. From Germany he received some Prussian generals (1883) who wished to reorganize the army by extending military service to Christians (1886), and a German financier who tried to draft an exact budget (1883). Except for the chronic agitation in Crete* and a number of movements in Albania (1884, 1887), peace was almost restored in the Empire. This period of calm was of advantage to the Armenians, Gregorian Christians, industrious and peace-loving mountaineers; they formed all over Asia Minor and at Constantinople a notable proportion of the merchants, workingmen, and also officials in employments where

*The organic statute of 1868, given to Crete after the insurrection, established a "national assembly," elected where the Christians had the majority. The Assembly and the Mussulman governor were in continual conflict. The Christians demanded first of all Christian and native officials and a part of the custom-duties and taxes of the island to meet the expenses of the island. One party (radicals) continued to make plans for separation, in harmony with a Greek committee at Athens. The insurrections continued during the war of 1877, in 1885, 1887, 1889, 1895, 1896. The Turkish government promised reforms by ordinance (1878, 1887, 1896); but the Christians have continued to complain of the despotism of the Mussulman officials and have finally compelled Europe to interfere.

real labour was necessary. Europe protected them as Christians and agents of civilization.

About 1890 Abdul-Hamid seemed to change his policy. Shaking off German and English influence, he turned to Russia and France. His policy toward the Armenians changed about the same time. Then began riots against the Armenians in Constantinople (1890), and in Asia Minor quarrels between the Armenians and Kurds—the latter encouraged by the Mussulman authorities (1893). A small national Armenian party was formed, directed by revolutionary committees, partly composed of Armenian subjects of Russia. It demanded, not separation, but simply autonomy for Armenians and guarantees for security. The government replied by condemning real or pretended revolutionists (1893), then by massacres (1894-95) directed by the Mussulman authorities, executed by soldiers or hired assassins. These massacres were, however, officially represented to Europe as Armenian revolts.

At length, to enforce the attention of Europe, a number of Armenian revolutionists made a sudden attack on the Ottoman Bank. The government immediately ordered the massacre of all the Armenians in Constantinople (August, 1896). In spite of the silence of the newspapers favourable to the government, information gathered on all sides and reports of European consuls ended by rousing Europe to an outburst of indignation against the Sultan and obliging the powers to unite in a demand for reforms and guarantees.

BIBLIOGRAPHY.

BIBLIOGRAPHY.—For works in French: **Lorenz**, "Catal. de la Libr. Fr." (analyt. tables).

DOCUMENTS.—The official documents and story of events in the annuals: "Annual Register," "Annuaire Lesur" and "Ann. des Deux Mondes," "Geschichtskalender," the official documents since 1861 in the "Staatsarchiv."—Among the numerous records of impressions, see particularly **Von Moltke**, "Lettres sur la Turquie," tr. from the German, 1877 (sojourn from 1835 to 1837); among political manifestos, **Midhat-Pasha**, "La Turquie, son Passé, son Avenir," 1878.

WORKS.—The best complete history is **E. Engelhardt**, "La Turquie et le Tanzimat. Hist. des Réformes depuis 1826," 2 vols., 1882-83, intelligent and very accurate.—**Rosen**, "Gesch. der Türkei," 2 vols., 1866-67 ("Staatseng. d. n. Z."), goes from 1826 to 1856.—**Juchereau de Saint Denys**, "Hist. de l'Empire Ottoman," 4 vols., 1844, stops at 1844.—**De la Jonquière**, "Hist. de l'Empire Ottoman," 1881; popular edit., a little confused, gives a bibliog.

For the crises, all of which had a European character, see the works

mentioned under chaps. xxv. to xxviii. For the Greek countries and Crete, bibl. may be found in **Hertzberg**; see the bibl. of chap. xxi.

For the reign of Abdul-Hamid, **F. Charmes**, "*L'Avenir de la Turquie*," 1883; **Georgiades**, "*La Turquie Actuelle*," 1892, and especially **V. Berard**, "*La Turquie et l'Hellénisme Contemporain*," 1893, "*La Politique du Sultan*," 1897 (for Armenian affairs). The best sources of Armenian affairs are the admirable series of English **Consular Reports** for 1896 and following years.

For Bosnia, "*Die Occupation Bosniens*," 1879-80, Austrian official publication.—"*Bosnien unter Oesterreichischer-ungarischer Verwaltung*," 1886, an anonymous work, rose-coloured.

CHAPTER XXI.

THE CHRISTIAN NATIONS OF THE BALKANS.

Christian Nations of the Ottoman Empire in 1814.—The European part of the Ottoman Empire, which, for want of a common name, we call by the two conventional terms *European Turkey* and the *Balkan Peninsula*, has always had, since the Middle Ages, a heterogeneous population, made up of several peoples with sharp distinctions of language, dress, and national feeling. They had been in fact separate nations, constituted as such long ago; the Ottoman conquest of the fifteenth century had covered them up and preserved them intact; the Turks had settled only Roumelia, the region about Constantinople.

Without counting the Gipsies and Jews, there were, in the Balkan Peninsula, five nations previous to the coming of the Turks, differing in race,* or at least in language: in the north-west the Servians,—in the west the Albanians,—on the south, in the islands and on the coasts, the Hellenes,—in the north, on either side of the Balkans, the Bulgarians,—and north of the Danube the Roumanians.

The Albanians, a mountain people, while preserving their national dress and customs and even their old language, *Schkipëtar*, had for the most part become Mussulmans, and consequently a part of the Ottoman nation. They furnished a good part of the officials and especially of the soldiers and military officers of the Empire. A part of the Servians had been converted, and formed in Bosnia a Mussulman aristocracy, which preserved the Slavonic tongue and national dress, but no longer felt itself in unison with the greater part of the nation, which was still Christian.

The Christian nations had nothing in common but religion, for the two Slavic peoples, Servians and Bulgarians, differed in

* They do not seem to have really been *races* in the anthropological sense, that is, species of men constituted with precise and hereditary physical characteristics; that is evident in the case of the Hellenes, who have absorbed so many of the Albanians, not to mention the Slavs.

language and costume. Except for the Bosnian Catholics, all the Christians in European Turkey were *Orthodox*,* in communion with the Greek Church of Constantinople. Their clergy consisted of married priests, of little education, and living in poverty without regular income, and of monks sworn to celibacy. The bishops, chosen from among the monks, were the heads, not only of the clergy, but also of the community. According to the general custom of the Orthodox Church, religion consisted mainly of practices, ceremonies, fasting, and pilgrimages; the clergy seldom preached or gave religious instruction, and had little influence over the intellectual life of laymen.

Each of these Christian nations formed a compact group on a portion of territory which was to become the centre of a Christian state. But each had also some of its members settled outside of its principal territory. This gave rise to complications of two sorts:

1. On the frontier of each territory, and in the intervening regions between the national centres, the population was a mixed one, composed of little national groups. This led to conflicts between the different Christian nations for the possession of these undecided territories. The complication was especially inextricable in the province of Macedonia, where, into a population mainly Slavic (Bulgarian or Servian) Albanian colonies and bands of Wallachian shepherds (Roumanians) had introduced themselves; also on the coasts and in the cities, where a whole Hellenic or Hellenized population had settled. The boundaries between the Servian and Bulgarian and the Greek districts were not only uncertain, but fluctuating; they varied with the changes of population, which were rapid in a country of high birth-rate; also with the progress of Hellenization, for the Hellenes have preserved the faculty of turning into Greeks the foreigners with whom they come in contact.

2. Each of these nations had outside of its territory members who were subjects of one of the great neighbouring empires, but who preserved their religion, language, and a vague sentiment of national unity. Thus the desire to establish the unity of the whole nation brought conflicts with great neighbouring states, who objected to any attempts at depriving them of subjects. There were Roumanians in Transylvania, in the Kingdom of

* The heretical sects, the Gregorians of Armenia, and the Nestorians of Chaldea and Syria, and the sects recognising Rome, were hardly represented in Europe, outside of Constantinople.

Hungary, in Bukovina in Austria, in Bessarabia in the Russian Empire; Servians in Hungary, Albania, and Herzegovina; Greeks in the islands and on the coast of Asia.

In 1814 all these Christian nations were subject to the Sultan. They have become independent during the course of the century. The Eastern Question has not been settled either by the Russian conquest or the reform of the Ottoman Empire, but by the separation of the Christian peoples, who have been organized into states on the European model.

The separation has come by degrees; except for Greece, the Christian states remained officially a part of the Ottoman Empire until 1878, and the last-born, Bulgaria, is still in that condition. But to understand their history, it is better, without regard for official forms, to study them separately, bringing each up to the beginning of its political life.

ROUMANIA.

The Principalities of Moldavia and Wallachia up to 1856.—Of all the Christian nations subject to the Sultan, the Roumanians had been least affected by Ottoman rule. The two principalities, *Wallachia*, the plain between the Danube and the Carpathians, and *Moldavia*, the plain between the Carpathians and the sea, had only become tributary to the Sultan. No victorious Mussulmans had come in to set themselves up over the Christian people; the principalities preserved all their social and political organization, their Christian aristocracy of landowners and dignitaries (*boïars*), their prince (*Hospodar*) elected by the aristocracy, and their Orthodox clergy.

But in the eighteenth century the Ottoman government, suspecting the Roumanian hospodars of relations with the Tsar, had adopted the custom of sending as hospodars Christians who were strange to the country. It usually chose Greeks from Phanar, the Greek quarter of Constantinople, who were rich enough to buy their nomination, and gave them but a short term; between 1716 and 1821 there were 37 hospodars in Wallachia and 33 in Moldavia. Since 1774 the Tsar, posing as protector of the Christians, had obliged the Sultan to promise to fix the tribute and appoint the hospodars for seven years.

During wars between Russia and the Sultan, the first act of the Russians was always to occupy the principalities and to organize there a provisional administration which lasted until their

withdrawal. In 1812 Russia kept a bit of Moldavia, Bessarabia, to the left of the Danube. On her withdrawal in 1834 she imposed Roumanian hospodars of her own choosing and left in force the *organic regulation* of 1831, drawn up in each principality under the direction of the Russian authorities by an assembly of boiars and bishops.

In both principalities political life was still rudimentary. The only cities were the two residences of the hospodars, Jassy in Moldavia and Bucharest in Wallachia, and the trading ports on the Danube and the Pruth. The population was composed almost entirely of peasants, settled in the great plains; the forest-covered mountains were practically uninhabited. The land was divided into great estates of 400 to 8000 hectares (1000 to 20,000 acres), belonging to the nobles, very few of whom, especially in Wallachia, resided on their estates, but left them in the hands of overseers. The peasants were therefore only tenants, cultivating from father to son a lot which their lord gave them in return for labour on the part of the estate reserved to himself. This labour, fixed officially at 12 days in 1831, was often trebled in practice. The peasants lived in wretched huts grouped in villages, with almost no furniture, for they could have saved nothing from pillage in that open country, constantly traversed by Russian and Turkish armies.* All public life was centred in the capitals, where the nobles flocked to the hospodar's court to spend their income. Bucharest had already a population of 100,000, palaces, theatres, newspapers, and carriages. It was an oasis of French civilization set in a Slavic and Oriental waste; for the Roumanians, a nation of Romanic language, were drawn toward France; their nobles learned to speak French and imported their luxuries and literature from Paris. Political interest was furnished chiefly by the boiars' complaints against the hospodars, whom they accused of despotic government.

It was the French revolution of 1848 that awoke the principalities to political life. The Roumanian nobles, in their admiration for France, followed the example of Paris. The nobles of Moldavia demanded a constitution from their hospodar Stourdza,

* Von Moltke, who saw Wallachia in 1835, described it as a desert plain, showing neither castles, bridges, mills, inns, gardens, nor trees; not even villages, for these are hidden and formed of low huts. The people are unarmed and bow down before any well-dressed man. In the houses there are neither dishes, furniture, nor provisions; the Wallachian carries his knife, pipe, and tobacco on his person, leaving nothing in his house.

who replied by ordering them out of the country; attempts were made to assassinate him. In Wallachia, the malcontents, aided by the people of Bucharest, forced Bibesco, the hospodar, to sign a constitution; then, when he fled the country, they set up a provisional government. But the Tsar interfered to support his *protégés*, the hospodars, and to put down the revolution. A Russian army took possession of Moldavia in July, then Wallachia, where a Turkish army had already seized Bucharest. The Tsar and the Sultan arranged by the treaty of Balta-Liman, May, 1849, to replace the two hospodars with successors appointed for seven years only, and to restore the organic regulation of 1831, with the promise to have it revised.

The war between the Tsar and the Sultan overthrew this combination. When the Russian army, in 1854, evacuated the principalities, Austria occupied them until the peace, in 1856.

Formation of the State of Roumania (1856-66).—The Roumanian state was the work of the European governments. The Congress of Paris, in order to keep Russia from monopolizing the protection of the Roumanians, put both principalities under the collective guarantee of the powers. The Sultan promised to leave them complete independence in internal administration; as he had already, in 1829, given up his fortresses and garrisons there, his sovereignty was reduced in practice to exacting a tribute and forbidding independent foreign relations. Moldavia recovered that part of Bessarabia which was taken away from Russia in order to keep her from the Danube. A European commission was appointed to organize the two countries, assisted by two councils (*divans*) elected by the inhabitants.

Two parties were formed on the final organization. Napoleon III. wished to see the Roumanian nation united, as did also the great majority of the Roumanians. The Ottoman and Austrian governments preferred to keep the two principalities separate; this system was advocated by a number of Moldavians, who feared the supremacy of Bucharest. The provisional governors appointed by the Sultan managed the elections so as to have non-unionists elected in Moldavia. But France intervened and obliged the Sultan to quash the election; the partisans of unity were then elected.

In October, 1857, the two councils of Moldavia and Wallachia asked for union in a single principality of Roumania, with a foreign prince. The Sultan refused and declared the councils dissolved; Napoleon supported the Roumanians. Finally, at the

Paris Conference, a compromise was effected: the principalities kept their two governments, two elective hospodars, and two representative assemblies; but, in 1858, they became the United Principalities of Moldavia and Wallachia, with a common commission of 16 members for common affairs and a common court of justice.

The complete union was established by an expedient. The two assemblies agreed, in 1859, to elect the same hospodar, a Moldavian boïar named Couza, who was proclaimed under the title of Alexander I., "Prince of Roumania." The Sultan finally recognised this as a title for life, in 1861. Couza then announced by a proclamation: "The Roumanian nation is founded." The two ministries retired and were replaced by a single ministry. The two assemblies were merged into a single National Assembly in Bucharest in 1862. Henceforth the Roumanian state had a government and a capital.

The formation of the union was accompanied by violent political agitations and a permanent conflict between the prince and the Assembly. The constitutional system, though officially established, was not put in operation. The prince governed despotically, without a regular budget, and changing his ministers from personal motives (twenty ministries in seven years). The Assembly voted an address claiming the constitutional system, then refused to vote the budget until the ministry recognised its financial rights. The prince closed the Assembly, and appointed himself commander-in-chief (1863). The Assembly, at its next meeting, passed a vote of lack of confidence against the ministry, then refused to discuss the budget. The prince made a *coup d'état*, copied after Napoleon III.; he declared the Assembly dissolved, took possession of the hall, suspended the press law, and promulgated a statute establishing universal suffrage, a Senate, and a Chamber. He had it ratified by a plebiscite by universal suffrage, 620,000 ayes against 1307 nays; he even exacted approval of the new system from his officials, on pain of dismissal. Then, in 1864, under pretext of a conspiracy, he had the leaders of the constitutional party arrested. After that he pursued a masterful policy, decreeing the budget, having his official candidates elected, and reducing the function of the legislature to mere registration of his decisions. He had himself declared hereditary prince in 1865, and having no children he designated his successor.

The Assembly represented in this conflict, not the entire na-

tion, but the Roumanian nobility, the only part of the nation of sufficient education to take part in political life; the mass of the nation remained inactive. Alexander attempted, like Napoleon III., to pose as a democratic sovereign. The Paris Convention imposed on the Roumanians the obligation of abolishing all class privileges and "proceeding without delay to the revision of the law regulating the relations of landlords with the farmers, with a view to bettering the condition of the peasants." The Assembly had been unable to agree on the reform, and the prince made it by decree, in August, 1864. The peasants received as their own property the land they possessed as tenants, and were freed from compulsory labour, paying instead an indemnity to the great landlords. The government assumed charge of the transaction, expropriating the landowners, but leaving them at least a third of their property and giving them a compensation. The land was distributed among the peasants in lots proportioned to their live stock. They were to pay for it in annual instalments spread over 15 years. Four hundred thousand families became proprietors.

Alexander was detested by the people of Bucharest. The Roumanian nobles took advantage of this to rid the country of him by a plot. The conspirators surprised him in his sleeping apartments, forced him to abdicate, and set up a provisional government which convoked the Chambers to elect a new prince. The Roumanians were convinced that their country could not be governed by a Roumanian prince, as the great families could not bear to yield obedience to one of their own rank. They therefore agreed to invite a foreign prince. The Chambers elected first a Belgian prince, who refused. A German prince of the Catholic branch of the Hohenzollerns became Charles I. of Roumania (1866).

The Constitutional Monarchy.—With the accession of Prince Charles a regular political life began. The Constitution of 1866 established in Roumania a liberal system like that in Belgium (jury trial, national guard, liberty of press and of public meeting), and the machinery of the government of the constitutional monarchies, a *responsible* ministry chosen by the King, a parliament consisting of two houses, both chosen by voters divided into groups by a system similar to the Prussian *classes*: a *Senate* of 120 members, of which 110 are elected from among the property owners by two groups of propertied voters, and a *Chamber of Deputies* of 178 members, elected by almost universal but un-

equal suffrage—the voters acting in four groups, of which the last includes all taxpayers. The country was organized on the French system of departments and districts, administered by prefects and subprefects; with centralized services, a Court of Accounts, and legal codes copied from France.

The former parties began to dispute for possession of the power. Their chief points of difference were on foreign policy and social tendencies. The *White* or Conservative party, composed of the great landowners and called the “Boiar party,” was Russia’s party, hostile to the foreign prince and ill-disposed toward reform. The *Red* or Liberal party wanted government by the middle class and alliance with Germany and Austria. The leader of the Liberal party, John Bratiano, gained for himself the name of Roumanian Bismarck. Between the two, as the result of personal rivalries, arose a third party, the “Young Right,” whose efforts were chiefly directed against Bratiano’s administration. A group of dissenters detached itself from the Liberal party, led by a brother of Bratiano; also another group under Rosetti, favouring universal suffrage. The struggles and coalitions between these groups made parliamentary life animated and complicated.

Charles I., who, until he became prince, had been an officer in the Prussian army, busied himself chiefly with the army and with foreign policy. He always observed very nearly the parliamentary principle, governing with ministers supported by the majority in the Chambers. But it is plain that in Roumania the ministry has such control over the elections that the sovereign may in many cases make the majority by calling to the ministry the party he prefers. Charles I., naturally leaning toward the Liberals, who favoured the German alliance, began with a Liberal ministry under Bratiano, and kept the Liberal party in office except when the united oppositions became too strong.

One of the great difficulties was in the financial organization; the country had already a heavy debt, amounting to almost \$160,000,000, and a chronic deficit which went on for twenty years. The state lands were sold, a government monopoly in tobacco introduced, the currency was reformed and placed on the decimal system. Bratiano’s program included the development of the country’s economic resources by establishing railroads and schools. But the Liberal party was still too weak to keep itself in power. The Roumanian sympathy with France made the position of a Hohenzollern prince a very difficult one,

as long as France and Prussia were on such bad terms. The Conservatives gained the majority in the Chambers. Charles I., feeling himself unpopular, resigned himself to a Conservative ministry, but occasionally tried to restore Bratiano until 1868. Roumania went through a period of severe struggles interspersed with outbreaks. In 1870 the Chamber officially expressed its sympathy with France, and the prince talked of abdicating; * a demonstration in honour of the German victory in March, 1871, led to a riot in Bucharest. Finally by means of a dissolution a Chamber was secured that was willing to support a compromise Conservative ministry under Catargi, who consented to govern in harmony with the prince. Order was restored, and the Catargi ministry remained in office until 1876. For the first time a Chamber lived out its term.

Charles I. laboured to build up an army on the Prussian model. He obtained a compulsory three-year service; but, as the budget would not permit the enrollment of the whole contingent, it was divided into two sections, a standing army for three years and a reserve, the *dorobanze*, called out for periodical practice. It thus formed an army of nearly 150,000 men in time of war, provided with modern artillery imported from Germany. This Roumanian army was to play a decisive part in the war against the Turks.

The prince's position was strengthened. When the crisis of the Ottoman Empire set in, Charles I. found himself strong enough to pursue a national policy. His plan was to free Roumania from Turkish sovereignty, which still made itself felt in many offensive ways. The Porte refused to call the country Roumania, to recognise her diplomatic agents in Turkey, or to let them settle the affairs of Roumanian subjects. Charles I. then shook off the Conservative party and, after trying a mixed ministry, took a Liberal ministry under Bratiano in 1876, which, with a short interruption in 1881 and several reconstructions, lasted until 1888.

Roumania, having entered the war against the Sultan, joined forces with Russia, who promised her the integrity of her territory. But in the peace Russia took Roumanian Bessarabia, which she needed in order to reach the left bank of the Danube;

* In a private letter dated 1871 he complains of the inexperience of the Roumanian people, who have "jumped from a despotic system to a most liberal constitution," and who "have not the necessary strength of character for an almost republican form of government."

in exchange she made the Sultan cede to Roumania the Dobrudsha, a fertile but unhealthy and deserted country. Roumania appealed to the Congress of Berlin, but secured only a slight increase of compensation.

The war made Roumania a sovereign state. Her independence, which had been proclaimed by the Roumanian Chambers as early as 1877, was officially recognised by the Sultan and the Congress, but on the condition of granting legal equality without religious distinctions; this related to the Jews of Moldavia, who numbered nearly 300,000, and had hitherto been excluded from political rights. The title of prince was replaced by that of King in 1881.

The Kingdom of Roumania was still, however, far from including the whole Rouman stock. Not to mention the Wallachian shepherds and Roumanish communities scattered through Bulgaria, Servia, and Macedonia, there remained a half million of Roumans in Bessarabia, 2,500,000 in Hungary and Transylvania, and 200,000 in Bukovina. A party has been formed to deliver unredeemed Roumania (*Roumania irredenta*). It has put itself in communication with the outside Roumans, especially those in Hungary, and has made sundry demonstrations against which the Hungarian government has publicly protested.

On the other hand an Orthodox Russian movement has been made among the clergy by the priests educated in the Russian seminary of Kiev, and among the peasants, by the popes and peddlers of patriotic Russian emblems. The Roumanian Church, governed by a synod of its own bishops, under the direction of lay officers, has been declared wholly independent of the Greek Patriarch of Constantinople. This led to an Orthodox agitation, aimed in reality against the King, on account of his being a Catholic. In order to calm the discontent the King had his nephew and heir, Prince Ferdinand, brought into Roumania; this prince has himself remained a Catholic, but has had his son baptized in the Orthodox faith (1893).

The Liberal ministry went on building railroads and establishing schools and supporting the King's military enterprise of turning Bucharest into a great fortified camp. The ministry attempted an agrarian reform. In 1884 it procured a revision of the Constitution, abolishing the national guard, and making the suffrage more democratic by suppressing the separate group of 3000-franc electors. A small socialist party was formed, having its centre at Bucharest and seeking to gain the support of the

peasants who were disappointed in their expectation of receiving lands.

The Liberal party, weakened by the divisions among its leaders, was overthrown by the agitation produced by the new understanding between France and Russia. The Conservative party accused it of having made the Roumanian army a part of the German army, and with having allied itself to the enemies of France. The Conservatives obtained a majority in the Chamber and even voted to impeach the Bratiano ministry (1889).

After the experiment of a coalition ministry of seceding Liberals and young Conservatives, the King, in 1889, went back to Conservative ministries, with a sprinkling of Liberal-Conservatives; these ministries lasted until 1895. At that time, Bratiano being dead, the Liberal party regained the majority and the ministry (Stourdza, 1895; Aurelian, 1896).

The industrial advance of the country has continued. If the debt has increased, it has been for the construction of state railroads. The credit of the government has been strengthened and its bonds have risen in price.

GREECE.

The Greek Nation before 1820.—Greece, conquered by the Ottomans, placed under Mussulman governors, and held down by Mussulman garrisons, had nothing corresponding to a national organization. The Greeks, since the Middle Ages, did not form a single nation. The Greek Church was common to all the Orthodox, so that outsiders made no distinction between Greeks and Slavs. But the Greek language had been preserved, and this, combined with memories of ancient Greece, was enough to keep alive the thought of an Hellenic nation. All the Christians who spoke Greek, not only descendants of the Hellenes, but also the Hellenized Albanians and Slavs, felt themselves to be members of one and the same illustrious race, to which it was glorious to belong.

The renaissance of the Hellenic nation became manifest at the end of the eighteenth century. Under the Sultan Selim, who favoured his Christian subjects, the Greeks had grown in numbers, wealth, and civilization. They had established the manufacture of silk and of cotton, especially in Thessaly. They had taken advantage of the European wars to build up a merchant marine under the flag of Turkey, which remained neutral. They

carried on almost the whole exportation of Russian grain from Odessa and a large share of European commerce in the Levant. Being good and courageous sailors, they made quick voyages at slight expense, for the crew consisted of the relatives of the owner and shared in the profits. It was said in 1816 that they had about 600 vessels and 17,000 sailors; they had established colonies of Greek merchants in the chief ports of the Mediterranean (Marseilles, Leghorn, Trieste, and Odessa) and even in London and Liverpool.

By contact with the civilized countries the Greeks advanced in civilization. Their merchants, enriched by the new trade, founded schools for the instruction of Greek youth at Bucharest, Corfu, and Constantinople. The Greek language, debased by centuries of barbarism, began to recover its purity. By the labours of Coraï, a practical compromise was found between the vulgar tongue and classical Greek.

Through education the Greeks became conscious of their nationality. The French Revolution aroused them;* later the destruction of the Republic of Venice created, in the Ionian Isles, an Hellenic centre independent of the Sultan. These France erected into the Republic of the Seven Isles. After their capture by England they were placed under an English governor with a special administration (1815).

The Greeks were scattered all over the Ottoman Empire, on the coasts and in the large cities. But a compact Greek population, in the southern part of European Turkey, occupied Morea, Romaïe (central Greece), Thessaly, and the islands. There were among them Albanian and Slavic Christians who were rapidly becoming Hellenized. In these regions there were Hellenic groups with enough strength of organization to have thoughts of national independence.

In Morea, where there were few Mussulmans, each Christian community was administered by its own notables; for the country as a whole the assembly of *primates*, elected by delegates from the communes, met each year with the Mussulman Pasha at Tripolitza. In Maina (ancient Laconia) the mountaineers, the Mainotes, remained armed, with leaders entrenched in strong castles and carrying on petty warfare with one another.

* Rhigas, the Greek patriot of Thessaly, composed a national hymn: "Rise, sons of Greece, the time of deliverance is nigh." The Austrian police handed him over to the Pasha of Belgrade, who had him drowned (1798).

In the mountains of central Greece and Epirus the Christians, Hellenes, and Albanians formed an irregular militia, the *Pallikares*, who kept their national dress and their national leaders, the *Armatoles*. But since the Turkish government, distrusting the Christian armatoles, had excited Albanian Mussulmans against them, the Pallicares had retired to the mountains and become *Klephts* or brigands. They defied the Turkish authorities and were the national heroes of the Hellenes; they fought in small bands, usually with guns, which they fired from behind rocks. There were no sailors then except in the islands, where the Greek population was allowed to govern itself, paying taxes to Turkey. Almost all the seafaring population was concentrated on three bare and barren rocks, the *Nautical Isles*, in the Argolic Gulf. The largest of these was Hydra, where the people, though wearing the Greek dress, were still Albanian and spoke the Albanian language; it had a population of 40,000, crowded into 3000 stone houses built in the shelter of a high bluff. The community was aristocratic, only the landowning "primates" could vote in choosing the 12 *demogerontes* (elders of the people) who governed the island. Spezzia, which was peopled by half-Hellenized Albanians, was less populous, less rich, and less aristocratic, with fewer "primates" and less powerful families. Psara, the smallest of the islands, was altogether Greek and democratic. All three lived like small republics, with the condition of sending presents to the dignitaries of the Turkish navy.

Their ships, armed with cannon for defence against the Barbary pirates, manned by semi-martial sailors, formed a veritable navy. The general peace, by putting an end to the privileged situation of the Turkish flag, had reduced the sailors of the Nautical Isles to inaction and disposed them to throw themselves into adventures.

Formation of the Kingdom of Greece (1820-29).—In 1820 Greece had warriors armed and ready to fight: the Morean mountaineers and Pallicares, and the sailors of the Nautical Isles. Her opportunity came when the revolt of a Mussulman governor, Ali, Pasha of Janina, set the example of insurrection. The Greeks revolted at once in Epirus, Morea, and the islands.

In Morea the "primates" sent to Tripolitza to check the rising judged it more prudent to join the rebels. The Mainotes came down from the mountains and the Archbishop of Patras called his flock to arms. In three weeks the Mussulmans had lost everything but the capital, Tripolitza. The Christian in-

surgeons, led by Kolokotroni, a Klepht, blockaded the city and finally massacred the Mussulmans (1821). This was from the first a war of race and religion, a war of extermination, in which prisoners and even women and children were massacred on both sides. The war was long and widespread, full of dramatic episodes which were sung by the poets and became famous all over Europe. It was a period of coercion in all the European countries; the newspapers, forbidden to concern themselves with domestic affairs, were full of the exploits of the Greek heroes.

In fact the fate of Greece did not depend on the insurgents, who were too few to resist all the forces of the Ottoman Empire; it depended on the Christian powers of Europe. But the insurgents' resistance gave the public opinion of Europe time to compel the governments to intervene. It took six years to do it.

The insurrection was entirely stamped out in Epirus, Thessaly, and Crete (1823-24), after a number of massacres. It centred itself in the three regions that were to form the Kingdom of Greece: Morea, the Islands, and central Greece. The Greeks held out there for four years, 1821 to 1825; they drove back a Turkish army in Morea in 1823, and destroyed a Turkish fleet in 1824; their methods were those of guerrilla warfare—ambuscades on land, fireships at sea.

The Greeks had as leader, at first, a young nobleman, Demetrius Ypsilanti, who came to their assistance with his followers and his black flag bearing the design of a phoenix (see p. 619); he was called the *Archstrategist*. A national assembly met in the woods near Epidaurus and proclaimed the independence of Greece. It formed governments of notables (*gerousies*), two for central Greece and one for Morea, with a common central government for the whole. But the Greeks, who grudged obedience to an outsider, soon got rid of the band of followers and the phoenix. They then broke into two parties—on one side the Morean primates and the people of the Nautical Isles, favouring European civilization, and directed by Maurokordato, who wore a black coat and an eye-glass; on the other the Morean warriors under Kolokotroni, the Klepht. The Klephts at first drove out the legislative assembly, and each party had its own government; then they fought each other, and the civilized party prevailed. After this they divided into primates and Nauticals, and went on fighting (1823).

At length, in 1825, two Mussulman armies invaded Greece at once. One, coming by land from the north, besieged Misso-

longhi, and made the famous assault and massacre in 1826. The other, under Ibrahim, came from Egypt by sea, landed in the south, and regained Morea. The struggle went on between the primate party, friendly to England, and the warrior party, friendly to Russia. Each had its assembly. They decided to join in a single assembly, which made the Constitution of Troezen and elected for seven years a head of the government (Kybernetes); they chose Capodistrias, an Ionian, an agent of Russia, with an English admiral-in-chief and general-in-chief. After the Turks took the Acropolis, in June, 1827, the insurgents had nothing left but some forts, without ammunition, provisions, or money.

Greece, which was already in Mussulman hands again, was delivered by the European powers. (On the negotiations and the succeeding war, see chap. xxv.) The governments of England, Russia, and France had finally decided to interfere. They meant only to intimidate the Sultan and make him give Greece an autonomous government; their fleets came to Greece only to compel Ibrahim's army to withdraw (1827). But the battle of Navarino, which came on against the wish of the governments, obliged them to active intervention. A French army took Morea from the Turks once more (1828), and the next year a Russian army forced the Sultan to accept the decisions of the powers. The London Conference created an independent Kingdom of Greece, eventually suppressing the tribute money which, according to its first plan, was to be paid to the Sultan. But it did not wish to found a true Greek nation. The territory of the Kingdom was made up, not of all the countries having a Greek population, but only of those that were still in insurrection in 1825: that is to say, Morea, central Greece, and the European islands. The King was to be a European prince, and they were long in finding him. Leopold of Coburg, who later became King of Belgium, refused the invitation in 1830.

The Absolutist System (1829-43).—Meanwhile Capodistrias was governing despotically and insulting the Greeks. "You are all of you," he said, "brigands and liars." The people of Hydra revolted, seized the Greek ships and burned them. The Maurosichalis, the chief family of the Mainotes, revolted. Capodistrias had the head of the family imprisoned and was himself assassinated in October, 1831. His brother tried to succeed him, but the malcontents formed a government which made war on him and forced him to flee. At length, in Otto, son of Louis,

the King of Bavaria, a prince was found who had no connection with any of the great rival powers and was an admirer of Greece.

The Greece resulting from this war and diplomacy was a small and poverty-stricken state (750,000 souls). It lacked the richest Greek region, Thessaly, and the principal island, Crete. The country left to it was laid waste and depopulated by a war of extermination drawn out through 10 years. It was still full of armed bands (the semi-brigand Pallicares); it was without resources, and was burdened already with a usurious debt contracted in 1824-25. The Greek nation has spent all the rest of this century in renewing its population, restoring its land to cultivation, ridding itself of brigands, and trying to increase its territory, and improve its financial condition. It has had but a slow and partial success in a task so out of proportion to its resources. The European public, which knew little of the actual condition of the country, expected a brilliant renaissance of ancient Greece. The disillusionment which followed this philhellenic enthusiasm produced a feeling of derisive contempt which the obvious progress of Greece has not yet altogether dissipated.

The Greeks were a people of peasants, sailors, and warriors, with democratic customs, but accustomed to rally around popular chiefs. In this mountainous country, without roads and almost without cities, the only public life was municipal life. Over this still semi-barbaric people was placed a European government. King Otto, who was still a minor, brought with him a Bavarian regent who governed until his majority; also a Bavarian ministry, Bavarian officials, and a small army of Bavarian volunteers. He himself, still a Catholic and a German, brought to his task the ideas and methods of personal government. Political life began with the Greek Orthodox antipathy to the foreign Catholics, with the dissatisfaction of the Greek pallicares, incorporated in an army with the German uniform; with the ravages of the disbanded pallicares who had become klephts with the Mainote revolt (1835), and finally with the irritation of the clergy against the organization of the Greek Church under a synod of 5 prelates and a lay proctor on the Russian model. The government succeeded, however, in organizing some of the institutions of a civilized state: a capital, at Athens instead of Nauplia, in 1834,—a gendarmerie in 1833,—an administration like that in France, 10 *nomes* with prefects, 42 *eparchies* with sub-prefects and communes under *demarchs* practically appointed by

the government,—a Council of State, composed of the principal Greeks, in 1835,—the University of Athens in 1837, which became a centre of learning and patriotism for the whole Hellenic world,—a national bank in 1841.

Greek politics were entirely controlled by its dependence on the three European powers that had established the kingdom and advanced the money necessary for its organization, in the form of a loan of \$12,000,000 guaranteed by all three. Each had its party. Russia supported the Napists, Capodistrias' former party, recruited among the clergy and the Orthodox believers, chiefly in Morea; France favoured the Coletti party, whose power was in central Greece; England, the Maurokordato and Tricoupis party, composed chiefly of the islanders. All three, struggling against the Bavarian court and government, agreed on a revolution. The Russian party wished to drive out the King and replace him with an Orthodox prince; the two others, to impose a constitution upon him. They took advantage of the government's financial embarrassment. England and Russia, by demanding interest on the loan and reduction of expenses in 1843, forced the King to disband his Bavarian soldiers. The Greek soldiers then revolted; the defenceless King dismissed his ministers, convoked a national assembly (1843), and accepted the Constitution of 1844. This was a liberal European constitution with a *responsible* ministry and two houses, a Senate chosen by the King, and a Chamber of Deputies elected, by universal suffrage, for three years, and receiving salaries.

Greece under the Constitutional System.—The King, in his subsequent isolation, was obliged to make honest application of the parliamentary system. Greece, alone among the new Balkan states, has been governed by ministers who are really subjected to the will of the majority, resigning under a hostile vote of the Chamber or the people.

This essentially democratic society, without religious passions, and but little influenced by the clergy, had no sufficiently sharp distinctions to make real parties. But as ways of making a career are few, employment scarce, and higher education confined to the upper classes, there are too many politicians and candidates for office for so poor a country. This causes sharp competition in elections to the Chamber and in the Chamber continuous struggles for possession of the ministerial offices. Greece is remarkable for the intensity of her political passions, shown in electoral struggles by administrative pressure, frauds,

and riots in connection with the ballot, and by the violence of the parliamentary debates and newspaper articles.

At first the contention for possession of power lay between the old parties. The advantage remained with the English and French parties, who had established a Western constitution and maintained the Catholic King, in spite of the Russian party. The French party then took the ministry (1844) and kept it. This caused trouble with the English government. On account of Don Pacifico, a Portuguese Jew and an English subject, whose house was pillaged in a riot in 1850, England sent a fleet to blockade the Piræus.

The Crimean war revolutionized Greek politics. The Greeks hoped for a chance to complete their territory through the war; they sent volunteers and arms to the Greek insurgents in Thessaly (1854). But England and France were unwilling to have the Ottoman Empire curtailed. French troops came to occupy the Piræus from 1854 to 1857. Greece was forced to accept peace with the Sultan and to promise to pay off the debt. Russia did nothing for Greece, preferring to protect the Slavic peoples.

The conduct of Greece's former guardians ruined the French, English, and Russian parties and completed Otto's unpopularity; he was reproached with having offered no resistance to Europe. The new division was between the court party and the democratic party. The court minister (Miaoulis, 1857-62), who maintained himself by "managing" the elections, became so unpopular that the army finally turned against the King. The soldiers revolted during the absence of the King and plundered the royal palace. A provisional government, composed of democrats, convoked a national assembly, which voted to dethrone Otto (1862).

The Greeks used this revolution to gain an increase of territory. The Ionian Isles, governed since 1815 by English governors, had a Greek population which had not ceased to ask annexation to the kingdom, and had even attempted revolts (1848-49). In 1862 England decided to give them to Greece, should the new King please her. The Greeks hastened to elect Prince Alfred, who refused; then they chose the English candidate, a son of Christian of Glücksburg, Crown Prince of Denmark. He became George I. in 1863. The Ionian Isles were annexed, and the University of Corfu was joined with that of Athens.

The Constitution of 1864 established liberty of the press and abolished the Senate. All the parliamentary power was centred

in the *Boulé*, elected by universal suffrage, increased to 192 members with a four-years' term. Political parties became hardly more than personal coteries (*Kommata*) known by the leader's name, and usually made up of men from his own part of the kingdom. The principal leaders were Komoundouros (Maina), Delyannis (Morea), Bulgaris (Nautical Isles), Zaïmis (Northern Morea), Deligeorgis (Missolonghi), and Lombardos (Ionian Isles). Competition was sharp and ministries short. It became the custom, as formerly in the United States, for each party to change all the officials when it assumed control, which finally gave political contests the appearance of quarrels for private interest. However, behind these rivalries there was perceptible a clashing between two opposing tendencies—a national tendency, hostile to European civilization, represented especially by Delyannis and the Moreans, and, on the other side, a European tendency represented by Tricoupis and his attempts at public works and the establishment of schools.

For fifteen years the ministry has alternated between Tricoupis (1882-85, 1886-90, 1893-95) and Delyannis (1885-86, 1890-92 and since 1895). The primary objects of Greek policy are still the completion of her territory and the payment of the national debt, both of which keep the Greeks strictly dependent on European governments and capitalists. At each crisis of the Ottoman Empire, Greece has attempted to regain a bit of Greek territory; but the powers have always interfered to prevent it:—after the aid given to Cretan insurgents in 1868, by the Conference of Paris (1869);—during the Russian invasion in 1878;—in 1886, in connection with Crete. France and Italy obtained for Greece a promise in 1878, which, after long negotiations, and mainly by English exertions, ended in the annexation of Thessaly in 1881. The finances have not yet been restored to order. The deficit goes on, increased by armaments for attempts at war against Turkey, and by railroads and canals. The debt, increased by borrowing to pay interest and by new loans (1864), grew to exceed \$100,000,000; payments were finally suspended in 1893.

Nevertheless the country is gaining in population (2,200,000) and in welfare. Her wealth increases with her agriculture and commerce. Primary education has become universal. At the same time the assimilating power of the Hellenes continues to increase the number of Hellenes in the Ottoman Empire. The whole number of Greek-speaking people is estimated at 8,000,000. The Kingdom of Greece is the national centre for the scattered

Hellenes, the Greek merchants of the large cities of Europe, and the Greek physicians of the Mussulman countries. It is to these "Homogenes" (people of the same race), enriched abroad but still Greek patriots, that the kingdom, and particularly Athens, owe the legacies and foundations that enable Greece to hold her place in civilized Europe.

SERVIA AND MONTENEGRO.

Formation of the Principality of Servia.—The Servian nation, which had suffered an effective conquest, had lost its national aristocracy. There remained only a peasant people of Servian tongue and Orthodox religion unable to read or write, living on corn and maize and herds of swine which fed in the oak forests. Mussulman warriors, settled in the country, occupied the place of an aristocracy. But the Servians were in relations with Austria; many of them served in the Austrian army, from which some returned to their homes having attained the ranks of inferior officers. These returned officers and the pork-dealers were the notables of this land of peasants.

The Christian Servians took advantage of a civil war between the Mussulman warriors, to revolt first in the name of the Sultan, then against the Mussulmans; they took Belgrade and plundered it in 1805. The swineherds of Schoumadia, accustomed to roam armed through the forests, and the brigands (*heiduques*), who were popular heroes as in Greece, were the fighting force of the insurrection. Georges, the leader, called by the Turks *Kara* (the Black), was a petty Austrian officer who had become a pork-dealer. The Tsar, who was at war with the Sultan (1806-12), upheld the Servian insurgents, who recognised him as their protector. But, after peace was made, the insurgents, abandoned by Russia, could resist no longer, and fled to Austria. Only a memory and some epic poems remained of Kara-Georges' Servia. The Turks re-established collectors, and began once more to impose forced labour, and to behead and impale Christians.*

A local chief (voivode) Milosh Obrenowitch, a pork-dealer and an enemy to Kara-Georges, took up the work of emancipation, but by different methods. He did not pose as a national

*The history of the Servian people before the independence and until 1820 is known almost entirely through oral tradition and the national songs.

hero, but as a servant of the Sultan. By protesting against the servile condition of Servia, he obtained power to collect the taxes and a right to keep arms. When Kara-Georges came back to Servia, he was assassinated, by order, it is said, of Milosh (1818).

Milosh, grown wealthy by levying taxes and holding the monopoly in the pork trade, induced the Ottoman government to give him the title of "Prince of the Servians of the Pashalik of Belgrade" (1820). During the Sultan's wars against the Greeks and against the Russians, Milosh remained neutral. The Sultan rewarded him by making him hereditary prince in 1830, withdrawing the Turkish garrisons from the country (except in Belgrade); he also gave him some of the districts inhabited by Servians outside of the Pashalik. This was the obscure beginning of the principality of Servia, under the form of a self-governing province of the Ottoman Empire, administered in the name of the Sultan by an hereditary native prince.

Milosh, established at Kragujevatch, in the interior, governed as an absolute monarch,* summoning only on great occasions the *Skouptchina*, a general assembly of the heads of families, which offered him no resistance. But he had displeased Russia, then all-powerful with the Ottoman government, and alienated many of his own supporters. A party led by his own brother Jephrem obliged him to accept a constitution in 1835; but the Russian and Turkish governments rejected it, and the opposition fled the country. Finally, in 1837, the Sultan and Russia imposed on him a constitution giving him three ministers and establishing a Senate of 17 life-members. The Senate, composed of his adversaries, asked him for accounts. Milosh attempted to get rid of the Senate by a peasant revolt; then, in 1839, abdicated in favour of his son Milan, a consumptive, who died soon after, leaving as his successor Michael, aged sixteen years.

Michael reigned with a regency composed of the notables that had overcome Milosh. But the regents could not agree. A strong party, supported by the Turks, revolted, drove out Michael, and made the *Skouptchina* elect Alexander Kara-georgewitch, the son of the national hero, Kara-Georges; the Sultan accepted him (1842). Alexander was a peace-loving prince. Established at Belgrade, where there was a

* Tradition tells us that he took what he chose, paying for it what he chose; whoever was imprudent enough to complain of him was assassinated and his murder credited to a Turkish brigand; he forced merchants of the Danube cities to come and mow and reap in his fields.

Mussulman garrison, he remained subject to Austria and the Sultan. He was reproached with receiving in Oriental fashion, with his fez on, and with allowing himself to be led astray by the Austrian consul. The Servians were Orthodox, and did not take kindly to a prince who favoured Catholics and Mussulmans, and who did not convoke the Skouptchina. The senators conspired against him in 1857. He had them arrested and dismissed from office; the Turkish government forced him to restore them. His ministers, working in harmony with Russia, had a Skouptchina elected which requested the Prince to abdicate. On his refusal, he was deposed and old Milosh recalled (1858).

Michael, who succeeded Milosh in 1860, seems to have had a plan to make one state of all the regions peopled by Orthodox Servians, by annexing Bosnia, Herzegovina, and Montenegro to Serbia. This nationalist policy demanded a military force in Serbia and an understanding with Servians abroad. Michael began to build up a Servian army. It was composed of a very small standing force of 2 battalions, designed only to serve as a nucleus; and, secondly, of a national militia to include all able-bodied men (80,000). Abroad the Servians excited and supported the insurgent Christians in Herzegovina (1862). This nationalist agitation led to conflicts in Belgrade between the Christian inhabitants and the Turkish garrison. The Turks fired on the city. The European powers intervened and obliged the Sultan to withdraw his troops from Belgrade. Turkish garrisons still remained in certain fortresses. By direct agreement with the Turkish government, Michael secured their withdrawal in 1867. He still kept the Turkish flag by the side of the Servian flag, as the last remnant of Ottoman rule in Serbia. He was about to secure something still better, the government of Bosnia, under promise of paying a tribute. This would have been a long step toward a Greater Serbia. But the hatred felt toward him by the family of Kara-Georges, the Karageorgewics, was a fatal obstacle. These opponents, supported by Austria, formed a conspiracy and assassinated Michael in 1868.

Servia under the Constitutional System.—Michael had no children; but his family, the Obrenowics, had become the popular national dynasty; the Skouptchina proclaimed Prince Milan, Milosh's grand-nephew, who was then 14 years old and was at school in Paris. The council of regency which governed in his name until his majority (1872) was presided over by Ristitch, the

leader of the Liberal party. Ristitch tried to organize the government on the European plan, by the Constitution of 1869.

The Senate was transformed into a Council of State of 11 to 15 members appointed by the government; its functions were to prepare legislation, to settle cases in administrative law, and in addition to supervise the public expenditures. The Skouptchina became a representative assembly, regularly elected, one member for every 10,000 in population. In this community of substantially equal peasant proprietors, there could be no thought of establishing either a middle-class representative system or an aristocratic second chamber. Suffrage was made almost universal, as every taxpayer could vote, and the deputies received salaries. The Skouptchina remained the only assembly, but to supply the place of an aristocracy, the prince was given the right to add members by appointment to the extent of one-fourth of the whole. Changes in the constitution, territory, or government were to be voted by a special Skouptchina, four times as numerous as the ordinary assembly. This was the beginning of political life in Servia. Parties were formed with European names: conservative, progressist, liberal, radical. Certain of these names covered nothing but personal rivalries between party leaders. However, it is plain that political life in Servia was in reality dominated by the opposition, if not between two parties, at least between two tendencies.

The Servian masses, essentially peasant and Orthodox, were determined not to be burdened with officials and taxes. The most prominent aims of their domestic policy were to procure communal autonomy, insist upon economy, and refuse to pay new taxes. In foreign policy their religious sympathies demanded alliance with Orthodox Russia, and the union of all Orthodox Servians to Servia. The Radical party, which has taken the direction of this movement, is above all a popular party with little love for Western civilization. Its instrument is the Skouptchina, whose elections, apart from government pressure, always give a Radical majority. Its centre was at first at Kragujevatch, the former capital, whose place has been taken by Belgrade.

The policy of the government, on the contrary, looked toward the introduction into Servia of the institutions of monarchical Europe. It desired to connect the country with the economic life of the civilized world by building railroads and developing her trade with Austria, the natural outlet for Servia's agricultural products. To do this the government had to raise money by

taxes and loans and make overtures to the Western governments, especially Austria. Its domestic policy therefore consisted in maintaining the supremacy of the central government in spite of the Skouptchina, extending the power of the officials at the expense of the communes, and increasing the standing army and the taxes. Its foreign policy was to secure an alliance with Austria. The partisans of this policy were few in number but they had the great advantage of having on their side all the permanent powers of the country,—the prince, the ministers, the Council of State, the office-holders and the army officers. The personal parties into which they were divided differed mainly, it seems, in the degree of arbitrary procedure that each was ready to employ in order to restrain the Radical movement.

The Liberal party, under Ristitch, governed during the regency, 1868 to 1872. Prince Milan, on attaining his majority, took a *Conservative* ministry, then a *Progressist* ministry. But the Christian revolt in Herzegovina excited national passion in the Skouptchina to the point of obliging Milan to take a Radical nationalist ministry (Grouitch and Ristitch), which decided to make war on Turkey with Russia's assistance.

Servia began the war (July, 1876). When conquered and invaded by the enemy, she was saved by European intervention, which imposed on the Sultan a truce, then a peace. But during the Russian invasion of 1877 Servia reopened the war. At the final peace of Berlin (1878) she obtained a territorial increase and complete independence. But the war had left a heavy debt, and the peace, by establishing Austria in the Servian country of Herzegovina, gave rise to great discontent, because it made the building up of a Greater Servia impossible. The Radical nationalist party, wishing to continue a Russian policy, negotiated with the Bulgarians to attempt a recovery of Bosnia with Russia's aid. In the meantime it protested against the plan of a railroad joining the Austrian system and rejected the commercial treaty with Austria.

Austria sent a threatening note which caused the dismissal of the ministry. The Austrian party took the power in October, 1880, and, under different ministries, for the most part Progressist, held it until 1887. The prince procured from Austria and his allies permission to take the title of *King* of Servia (1882). The Radicals protested against the treaty concluded with the *General Union* (Bontoux) and demanded a revision of the constitution in 1883. The government got rid of the opposition at first by an-

nulling the elections of Radicals (1882) and later by a *coup d'état*. The Radicals had regained the majority; the King adjourned the Skouptchina, suspended the guarantees of liberties, put the country under martial law, and ordered the surrender of all arms. The Radicals rebelled, and the insurrection ended in the shooting of many, a vast prosecution (819 accused), and the establishment of absolutism (1883). The Skouptchina, elected under official pressure, was merely an instrument for voting government proposals. In place of the poll-tax a new system was established of taxes on land, houses, capital, income (1884), and a government monopoly in tobacco. The communes lost their autonomy, with their right to levy taxes and dispense justice. Servia came under a centralized administration after the European model. She began to have a standing army like the European countries (25,000 infantry), with a three-year service; also a European debt formed during the war of 1876-78, and increasing with subsequent deficits (it was \$5,000,000 in 1878 and \$65,000,000 in 1895).

The war of 1885 against Bulgaria, which ended in defeat and invasion, made the government and the King so unpopular that after several ministerial crises and reconstitutions of the Garaschanine ministry, the Austrian Progressist party found itself unable to govern. Milan gave the ministry to the nationalist opposition, the Russian party, a coalition of Radicals and Liberals; first a Liberal ministry under Ristitch (1887), quickly succeeded by a Radical ministry under Grouitch.*

The Radical party made the Constitution of 1888, which transformed the Skouptchina into a purely representative assembly, suppressing the one-fourth appointed by the King, and greatly increasing its powers. Milan abdicated in 1889, declaring that he would not be "a King for signing papers." His son Alexander being still a minor, he appointed a regency under Ristitch, who promised to maintain the same foreign policy. Servia seemed to have entered upon the parliamentary system under the direction of a Radical-Liberal coalition.

*The domestic quarrels of the royal family, which were given such notoriety by the European papers, were nothing more than episodes. In 1888 Milan, having quarrelled with Queen Nathalie, the daughter of a Russian colonel, prevailed on the Metropolitan to pronounce a divorce, and got back the Crown Prince, who had been taken to Germany by his mother. Nathalie returned to Belgrade in 1889. The government begged her to go away and finally insisted upon it. The people rallied to her defence, and she was taken away in the night (1891). Later the king and queen were reconciled and annulled their divorce (1893).

But Milan took advantage of the discords between the Radicals and Liberals of the regency to resume control of the young King secretly. Alexander I., by his father's advice, made two *coups d'état* in succession: 1. He declared himself of age, had the regents arrested, and gave the ministry to his teacher Dokitsch, who rested on the Liberal party (1893). He brought his father to Servia, and, in order to silence the newspapers, which were attacking him, restored to him by decree the rank of member of the royal family. 2. Breaking with the Radicals, he issued a decree abrogating the Constitution of 1888 and the laws guaranteeing liberty of the press and communal elections. He also restored the Constitution of 1869. He then put himself in the hands of the Austrian party, which, under ministries of different names, Liberal (Christitch) or Progressist (Garaschanine), has kept the power and governed with the support of the officials and military officers, levying the taxes by royal decree, arresting or dismissing Radical and Liberal leaders, and procuring the election of a ministerial Skouptchina. The negotiations between the King and the Radical party for the establishment of a constitution having come to nothing (1896), Servia remains under a provisional system.

Montenegro.—Tchernagora, better known by the Italian name Montenegro, is a small, almost inaccessible country lying in the range of mountains that skirts the eastern Adriatic. It had maintained itself as a practically independent district within the Ottoman Empire. Its inhabitants, Orthodox Serbs, nominally Turkish subjects, formed a small nation of armed mountaineers, governed by a family of national and religious leaders who succeed each other from uncle to nephew, with the title of *Vladika* or prince-bishop. It was a democracy of warriors; the women cultivated the land and the men practised arms. The neighbourhood of Herzegovina gave Montenegro a political rôle; the *Vladikas* became allies of Russia, which used the Montenegrins to rouse the Christian Serbs of Herzegovina and to make raids upon the Turks.

In 1851 Danilo, on succeeding his uncle, dropped the title of *Vladika*, married, and founded the dynasty of the princes of Montenegro. The Sultan sent an army against him, which the Tsar obliged him to recall (1852). Then, in return for the attitude he had taken in the Crimean war, the Prince of Montenegro received an annual subsidy from the Tsar. Danilo was killed by a private enemy in 1860 and was succeeded by his nephew Nikita.

Montenegrin political life consisted of little more than the almost continual struggle against the Mussulmans, which came to open war during the Herzegovina insurrections (1862 and 1876). Russia repaid Montenegro's services in the campaign of 1877 by making the Sultan cede to her a larger and more populous territory than the whole former principality, with a port which assured her communication with Europe (1878). But the Albanian Mussulmans who occupied the country refused to give it up; and Montenegro got possession of it only after a long war and the famous demonstration of the European fleets before Dulcigno.

Of domestic political life there has been extremely little. The prince, once officially independent of the Sultan, has remained an absolute sovereign, controlling the budget, exercising all the powers, appointing even Church officials. But he has covered the patriarchal system with European forms. The administrative Statute of 1879 established a legislative *Council of State* of 8 members, half chosen by the prince, the other half elected by the people. A legal code of the French sort has been adopted. The organization has remained military, the people divided into tribes, each with its elective elders and its military chief. But the princely family of Montenegro, by means of marriages with the reigning families of Russia (1889) and Italy (1896), has entered the society of European dynasties.

BULGARIA.

The Bulgarian People before the Union of 1885.—Bulgaria, like Servia, had a Christian population of Orthodox Slavs, subject to a Mussulman aristocracy. The Bulgarian people was made up only of peasants, tenants of Mussulman landlords. But while the other Christian nations retained at least their national clergy, the Bulgarian clergy, subject to the Greek Church of Constantinople, had been disorganized. The Greek bishops had endeavoured to Hellenize the Orthodox Bulgarians, by replacing their Bulgarian religious books with Greek books, the Slavonic liturgy with the Greek liturgy, and by establishing Greek schools. In the Ottoman Empire where every nationality was represented by its national church, the Bulgarians, subjected as they were to Greek bishops, had ceased to form a nationality. They were counted in with the Greeks under the general head of Orthodox Greeks. The world had forgotten the Bulgarian people. The Russians,

when they occupied the country in 1828, were surprised to find a Slavic people, speaking a language much like their own.

With the Russian occupation the Bulgarian nation awoke to new life. A number of patriots took heart and entered into a struggle with the Greeks. The upper Greek clergy, supported by the Turkish government, persecuted the patriots, whom they suspected of acting as agents of Russian propagandism. In order to escape the Greek clergy, the Bulgarians, following the advice of Austrian Catholics, began about 1859 to form United Greek churches, which entered the Catholic communion by submission to the Pope, on condition of preserving at the same time their Slavic rite and their married priests. The Bulgarians as a consequence became the *protégés* of the Catholic powers—France and Austria. Russia was so disturbed at the loss of them that she persuaded the Sultan to institute an independent Bulgarian Church with a supreme head, the *Bulgarian Exarch*, established at Constantinople in 1870. The Greek Patriarch excommunicated the Bulgarian clergy.

The Bulgarians were still only a nation of *raïas* under Mussulman administration. An insurrection, organized by a committee established in Roumania, led to the famous massacres of 1876 (see p. 632) and the Russian occupation. The Bulgarian state was founded by Russia after the war. The principality of Bulgaria, as Russia arranged in the treaty with the Sultan, was to comprise the whole Bulgarian race, including Macedonia, which was inhabited by a mixture of nationalities—Bulgarians, Servians, Greeks, Wallachians, and Albanians. The new state seemed destined to remain under Russia's hand.

The Congress of Berlin, fearing Russian influence, cut the Bulgarian state into three parts. It restored the Sultan to full possession of Macedonia. Of the Bulgarian region south of the Balkans, it made eastern Roumelia a self-governing province under a mixed administration. It left to Bulgaria only the northern region, which became tributary to the Sultan, like Roumania before 1878, with a prince elected by the country and approved by the Sultan.

The principality of Bulgaria was organized by the Russians who occupied the country and who, on withdrawing, left military officers there. The Constitution of 1879 was presented by the Russian governor to an elective national assembly and was adopted by it. As in Servia, it established a ministry and a single assembly, the *Sobranje*, elected by universal suffrage, with a

quarter of the members to be chosen by the prince, and a double number for changing the constitution; it proclaimed all the modern liberties. In Bulgaria, as in Servia, society was democratic, composed of peasants, *popes*, and school-teachers. The prince elected by the assembly was Alexander of Battenberg, whom the Tsar had suggested. A Bulgarian militia was organized and commanded by Russian officers, with an outfit left by the Russian army. In fact, Bulgaria was at first governed by the Russians, as the grateful assembly recognised those who remained in the country as having all the rights of Bulgarian citizens, and consequently admitted them to every office.

The Bulgarian assembly soon broke up into political parties, which astonished the outside world by their practical sense. The chief leaders were teachers who had been educated abroad. The division came on the nationalist question. The conservative party (Grekoff) resigned themselves to the separation of Roumelia in order to avoid trouble with Europe. The nationalist party, which demanded unity at the risk of war, was composed of two groups, Liberals (Zankoff) and Radicals (Karaveloff). These divisions corresponded to personal rivalries. Prince Alexander formed a Conservative ministry, favourable to an alliance with Austria. The Radical-Liberal party, which was popular with the masses, had a majority in the *Sobranje* (1879). Political life began with a conflict between the prince and the assembly. The *Sobranje* was dissolved in 1879 and re-elected in 1880. Alexander tried a nationalist ministry, and then made a *coup d'état*. He dismissed the ministry, convoked an assembly, suppressed the constitution, and secured for himself special powers (1881). He formed a Conservative ministry under two Russian generals, who ended by dismissing the Conservatives and governing alone.*

The leaders of all the Bulgarian parties, discontented with this foreign government, arranged secretly among themselves, then with the Prince, to rid themselves of the Russians. The *Sobranje* suddenly presented an address to the Prince, begging him to re-

* Skoboleff, one of these Russians, tells us that Alexander attributed the *coup d'état* to the Russians in order to damage their popularity, but had in fact made it himself at the instigation of Austria. He further says that the Conservative party, to which his colleagues belonged, was only a clique of some two hundred persons hostile to Russia; that the leaders of this faction, knowing their own unpopularity, attempted to veil their anti-Russian designs under cover of a partly Russian Cabinet.

store the Constitution of 1879, and suggesting the desired amendments. The Russians were taken by surprise; they left the assembly in a fury and handed in their resignation.* The prince formed a coalition ministry of Conservatives and Liberals (1883), then an exclusively Liberal ministry. The revised constitution created a second Chamber. But Russian officers continued to command the Bulgarian army; the Russian diplomatic agent excited against the Liberals the Radical party, which gained a majority in the *Sobranje* of 1884 and was put in possession of the ministry.

Meanwhile eastern Roumelia had been organized as a self-governing province with a national militia commanded by European officers, an elective provincial assembly, a Christian governor appointed by the Sultan for 5 years, and a directory to perform the functions of a ministry. The first governor was Vogorides, a Greek, who surrounded himself with Bulgarians; the second, appointed under Russian pressure, was one of the members of the directory, a Bulgarian (Krestowitch), who took the name of Gavril-Pasha. The provincial assembly desired union with Bulgaria; the officials and military officers endeavoured to make way for it. It was a general conspiracy. One day (September 18, 1885) a battalion of militia arrested the governor and the general-in-chief; a provisional government was set up and was at once recognised by all the local authorities. It asked aid from the Prince of Bulgaria. The Tsar, who had been displeased with the Bulgarians since 1883, did not want the union. Prince Alexander knew this,† but he had to choose between a rupture with Russia and a breach with his own subjects by fighting the Roumelian Bulgarians. He agreed to the union, took the title of "Prince of the Two Bulgarias," and went with his army to take possession of Roumelia, where he was recognised as prince by a general vote of the inhabitants.

Bulgaria since the Union of 1885.—The union transformed Bulgarian politics. At first the great powers, fearing a general insurrection, condemned the action of the Bulgarians. The

* According to an Austrian account, Kaulbars left the hall crying: "Pigs, blackguards, liars!" while the Bulgarians replied with cheers.

† He had been informed of it in an interview with the Russian minister, Giers, and had replied that the people desired the union, but did not seem ready for it. He was warned of the revolution three days in advance, it is said, by a delegation from the revolutionary committee, and dissuaded them from the idea; but on their return the delegates found the revolution already in progress.

Tsar recalled the Russian officers who were in command of the Bulgarian army. The European ambassadors at Constantinople "condemned the revolution" and called upon the Bulgarians to disarm and dissolve the union. Then the Servian army invaded Bulgaria, which was unprotected on the western side. Alexander came back from Roumelia. The army, with Bulgarian officers in place of the Russians, took the offensive, forced the Servians back through the passes and drove them into Servia. Europe imposed peace.

Bulgaria's victory made the separate existence of Roumelia impracticable. The great powers continued, however, to demand execution of the Treaty of Berlin and to refuse to recognise the new state formed by the fusion of the two Bulgarias; but they contented themselves with a protest. The Turkish government finally accepted a compromise: Alexander was appointed governor of Roumelia (1886).

Russia would not be appeased. The result was to make of the Radical party, determined to maintain the union, a nationalist party opposed to foreign intervention. This party kept the ministry and had an enormous majority in the *Sobranje*, now reinforced by delegates from Roumelia. Zankoff, the leader of the Liberal party, became an agitator in Russia's service against the government. There remained a strong Russian party in the army and among the Orthodox clergy. The officers of special military services and the pupils of the military school at Sofia made a military *coup d'état*. Alexander, surprised by the conspirators, was forced to abdicate and was carried out of the country. Zankoff issued a proclamation explaining the deposition as the result of following a policy hostile to the Slavic race (August, 1886). A counter revolution quickly followed. The conspirators were arrested, Alexander was recalled and received with acclamation. The Tsar, however, refused to approve his return. Alexander abdicated, and a regency of three members took the power until a new prince should be elected.

Stambouloff, one of the regents and president of the *Sobranje*, then took charge of Bulgaria. He governed in harmony with Moutkouroff, the Roumelian commander of militia; but he quarrelled with the third regent, Karaveloff, the former leader of the Radical party.

Bulgaria's whole political life turned on plans for inducing Europe to accept the union and on the struggle against the Russian party. Russia refused to recognise the *Sobranje* because of

the presence of the Roumelian delegates. She demanded first (1886) the withdrawal of martial law and the holding of new elections; then, in 1887, a Russian general for regent, and for prince the Prince of Mingrelia, a Russian subject. The *Sobranje* refused in the name of national independence. But it was not easy to find a prince. Waldemar of Denmark was elected in 1886, but refused. The Bulgarian government gave up trying to appease the Tsar and decided to lean on Austria. It had a Catholic prince elected, Ferdinand of Coburg, an officer in the Hungarian army (July, 1887), who took a Stambouloff ministry. The powers refused to recognise him.

The Russian party in Bulgaria tried, by means of intrigues, military plots, insurrections (February, 1887, November, 1887, 1888), and attempts at murder (1887, 1891), to overthrow Stambouloff and put the country under Russia's protection once more. Stambouloff defended himself with prosecutions, executions, suppressions of newspapers and a system of terror; he was accused of torturing accused men and condemning innocent men (case of Major Paniza, 1890). The Liberals protested against the violation of the liberties guaranteed by the constitution. But the government was consolidated; Ferdinand was recognised by the Sultan, and had the constitution revised, cutting down the number of deputies and increasing their term from 3 to 5 years. The Metropolitan was condemned to prison for preaching a sermon against the Catholic prince.

At length Ferdinand, wearied of obeying Stambouloff, took a Conservative ministry, recalled the former leaders, the Radical Karaveloff and the Liberal Zankoff, and made advances to the Orthodox Russian party (1894). Stambouloff was assassinated in 1895, and his murderers are still unpunished. Ferdinand has had his son, Crown Prince Boris, baptized into the Orthodox Church (1896), with the Tsar for his godfather. Bulgaria has been reconciled with Russia, and at the same time has maintained her national independence and unity.

The agitation for the union of Macedonia continues. Bands of Bulgarian insurgents have fought small battles in the cause (1896). But the Bulgarian agitation meets other agitations in Macedonia, for the population there is very mixed, and it is doubtful whether the majority of Slavs are Bulgarians or Servians.

BIBLIOGRAPHY.

BIBLIOGRAPHY.—**Lavisse** and **Rimbaud**, "Hist. Générale," vol. ix., p. 737, indicates complete histories.—See **Lorenz**, "Catalogue de la Librairie Franç.," for books written in French; for Greece, **Hertzberg**, "Gesch. Griechenlands," which may serve as a bibliography; for Roumania, **Bergner**, "Rumänien," 1887, **J. Bengesco**, "Bibliogr. Franco-Roumaine du XIX^e S.," 1895.—For recent works see the "Jahresberichte der Geschichtswissenschaft" (since 1878).

DOCUMENTS.—The majority of documents and references are found in the three "Annales" and the "Staatsarchiv" (see Pref. p. viii.), or in the reviews published in Germany, France, and England, mentioned in the bibliog. for each of these countries.—For Roumania, **Petrescu** and **Stourdza**, "Actes et Documents Relatifs à l'Histoire de la Régénération de la Roumanie," 7 vols., 1889-92.

WORKS.—**COMPLETE HISTORIES:** **Bamberg**, "Gesch. der Oriental. Frage" (Oncken coll.), period 1856-78.—**Oncken**, "Zeitalter d. K. Wilhelm" (Oncken coll.).

DESCRIPTION OF POLITICAL CUSTOMS: **E. de Laveleye**, "La Péninsule des Balkans," 1886, the story of a flying trip.—**Sp. Gopcevic**, "Der Turko-Montenegrinische Krieg, 1876-78," 3 vols., 1879; "Serbien und die Serben," 1881; "Oberalbanian und seine Liga," 1881; "Bulgarien und Ostrumelien, 1876-86," 1886, "Makedonien und Alt-Serbien," 1889; journalistic works; insufficient, but full of interesting details.

ROUMANIA: **Prince Bibesco**, "Roumanie, 1829-49," 2 vols., 1893-94.—**Samuelson**, "Roumania," 1882 (in English).—**R. Bergner**, "Rumänien," 1887.—**Blaramberg**, "Essai sur les Institutions de la Roumanie," 1885.

GREECE: **Mendelssohn-Bartholdy**, "Geschichte Griechenlands," 2 vols., 1870-74 ("Staatengesch. d. n. Zeit." coll.).—**Hertzberg**, "Gesch. Griechenlands," vols. iii. and iv., 1879 (Gotha coll.), stops at 1878, both scientific and critical.

In addition to the works previous to 1878 mentioned in **Hertzberg**, see **Thouvenel**, "La Grèce du roi Othon," 1890, private letters of a diplomat.

SERBIA: **Ranke**, "Serbien und die Serben," 1879, chief history of the independence.

BULGARIA: **Jirecek**, "Das Fürstenthum Bulgarien," 1891, chief complete history.—**Kanitz**, "Donau-Bulgarien," 3 vols., 1877-80, for the Turkish period.—For Alexander's reign: **A. Koch**, "Prinz Alexander von Battenberg," 1887; the author was the prince's chaplain.—**A. v. Huhn**, "Der Kampf der Bulgaren um ihre Nationaleinheit," 1886; "Aus Bulgarischer Sturmzeit," 1886, from the German point of view.—**Sobolew**, "Der Erste Fürst v. Bulgarien," 1886, trans. from the Russian.—**Draudar** . . . "Prince Alexander of Battenberg," 1884.

CHAPTER XXII.

TRANSFORMATION IN THE MATERIAL CONDITIONS OF POLITICAL LIFE.

Industrial Inventions.—No other period in the history of the human race has seen such profound and rapid transformations in the material conditions of life as have taken place in Europe during the nineteenth century. The practical arts, which had been merely improved since old times by slow changes in points of detail, have been so completely revolutionized that the distance is much greater between the industrial processes of the eighteenth century and those of the present day than between those of the eighteenth century and the ancient arts, even those of Egypt.*

This revolution is the result of technical inventions made partly by experiment, partly by methodical application of the theoretical sciences. Many of these inventions date back to the last third of the eighteenth century; but their practical effect was not felt by the masses in Europe before the end of the wars of Napoleon. The transformation of industrial life did not really begin until after 1814. It is the greatest modern event, an international event, for the inventions have been made by scholars and inventors of all nations, united in so close an international collaboration that it is not always possible to determine which country took the initiative in each; and they have passed from one nation to another, gaining imperceptibly from each.

We are already so accustomed to the new conditions of material life that we can hardly realize the Europe of 1814, so near to us in space of time and so far from us in conditions of life. It is therefore well worth our while to recall the principal inventions which in three-quarters of a century have placed such a distance between our ancestors and us. I shall not try to give their history; almost all of them have been accomplished at dif-

* To get an impression of this vast difference in the rapidity of evolution we need only compare the paintings on the Egyptian tombs representing the trades, the *Encyclopædia* engravings of the 18th century and the figures in any contemporary work of popular science.

ferent times by a series of fumbles and successive improvements,* which make it difficult even to classify them in chronological order. It is enough here to enumerate them and group them according to the knowledge of which they are the application.

The mechanical inventions, almost all made in England in the eighteenth century, were at first hand-machines, machines for spinning cotton, for spinning wool, for carding wool, for weaving cotton, for weaving wool, for making stockings. Between 1790 and 1815 the English used water-power for driving their spinning and weaving machines. Steam was not used until later. Agricultural machinery and machinery for the manufacture of paper were slow in coming into use. Invention has revolutionized modes of communication by macadamized roads (1820) and graded tracks—which have replaced the costly and uncomfortable stone roads, with their direct lines and steep grades; also by suspension bridges, viaducts, and railroad tunnels.

Machinery, by transforming the extractive industries, has procured in enormous quantities the materials necessary to other industries—coal, metals, and petroleum. The manufacture of metals, transformed by the use of coal, the building of great furnaces and steam hammers, has furnished iron, brass, and steel, which are the primary materials in the manufacture of the instruments of modern industry: tools, arms, rails, machines, frameworks, and bridges.

The gold and silver mines have been doubled in production by the use of the new machinery and chemical processes.†

The study of physics has furnished the two most characteristic forces of modern civilization, steam and electricity. Steam has been put to three great uses: first, the stationary steam-engine, used first in the mines, which now replaces animal and natural forces in all the great industries, spinning and weaving, and even in agriculture for threshing and reaping; secondly, the steam-

* For example, the electric telegraph and steamboats.

† The following table gives, where estimate is possible, some approximate figures on the increase in annual production, in millions of tons:

		England.	France.	Germany.	Belgium.
Coal,	1850	64	4	5	6
"	1887	162	20	60	18
Iron,	1850	2.2	0.4	0.2	
"	1887	7.5	1.5	4	

The total production of gold is estimated at \$600,000,000 from 1800 to 1848; from 1848 to 1890 at \$5,000,000,000.

ship, which has quickened transportation by water; and, thirdly, the locomotive and the railroad, which have increased in vast proportion the power and speed of transportation by land.* Electricity is more recent, but has already given us the electric telegraph, both land lines and submarine cables, the telephone, electric lighting, electric street cars, the galvanic battery, and the phonograph.†

Chemistry has given us the greater number of secondary inventions: chemical phosphorus matches in place of the steel, which was slow and hard to handle; chemical fertilizers, which have revolutionized agriculture; beet-sugar; illuminating gas, till recently the great means of lighting public places; colours extracted from coal, benzine, and creosote; photography and heliogravure; new explosive materials; chemical medicines; chlorine for bleaching and extracts for tanning; preserved foods, the extraction of aluminum, production of paper from wood-pulp, etc.

The biological sciences have made less progress, but they have given us, in particular, anæsthetics, which facilitate surgery, and antiseptics, which have transformed the practice of medicine. We must not forget the improvement in grain-raising and cattle-breeding, resulting from methodical experiments connected with the modern sciences.

This summary review of the principal inventions is enough to recall the mighty changes that have taken place in our life. My object is merely to show how this material transformation has affected European politics, directly by changing the practical conditions of government, indirectly by transforming the composition of society.

New Means of Destruction.—Until the middle of the century the world was still using the old explosive substances of the end of the Middle Age. The armies of 1814 had still only powder and guns with the flint-lock; cannon had been somewhat improved, but were still loaded from the muzzle. They were short-range arms which were slow to load and inaccurate in fire. Their chief advantage was their moral effect; they did not hinder a disciplined troop from keeping themselves in a firm mass, com-

* It is estimated that the cost of transportation in Germany has already decreased in the proportion of 20 to 1.

† Under the head of physics come also the optical instruments, microscope and lighthouse lenses. Neither air-balloons nor diving bells have as yet altered the conditions of life.

ing up close to the enemy, and making use of the bayonet. In order to join a revolt at this time one needed only a fowling-piece, powder, and balls; the difference in armament was hardly perceptible between soldier and insurgent, and in a street fight the insurgent, being in shelter, even had the advantage.

The new explosive substances have given the governments a destructive force which has changed the art of repression. The first was fulminate of mercury, which led to the invention of percussion caps. In 1847 came the much more important discovery of the explosive property of nitric compositions, primarily *nitroglycerine*, which, mingled with inert matter, became, in 1864, *dynamite*. The new *shattering* explosives, furnished by the nitric compositions, which are exploded by an instantaneous chemical combination, have a destructive force greatly superior to powder, whose explosion, produced by heat, is much slower. Mine-powder was replaced by dynamite, not only for submarine mines and torpedoes, but also in the work of blasting for the construction of roads. Gunpowder, which is still used, has been replaced for guns by the new smokeless powders, invented in 1870, in all the different countries independently; for artillery it has been replaced by compositions of nitric or picric acid, *melinite*, *roburite*, etc.

At the same time a revolution was introduced in the construction of arms. Guns were invented with central percussion and a prepared cartridge loaded at the breech. This has greatly increased the rapidity and slightly increased the accuracy of the shot. The first application of it was the needle-gun (Dreyse), adopted for the Prussian infantry as early as 1847, but only slowly imitated in the other countries. France clung to the muzzle-loader (Lefauchaux). It was only after the Prussian victories of 1866 that the breech-loader became, under various forms (Chassepot, Mauser, Martini), the weapon of all Europe. A parallel evolution in artillery produced breech-loading cannon (the English Armstrong gun in 1854), perfected in Germany (Krupp), and later steel cannon and howitzers, throwing shells by use of melinite. This revolution in arms was traceable to chemical discoveries. Smokeless powder, by increasing the explosive power, makes possible a lighter gun, a smaller ball, and a longer range. This was shown in the weapon improperly called the "Lebel gun."

All these new instruments of destruction, so much more efficacious than the old ones, have transformed the conditions of

warfare. The old fortified cities, incapable now of resistance, have lost their military rôle as defenders of the frontier. Nothing is of value now but intrenched camps, centres of supplies defended by a circle of detached forts. The use of great masses of soldiers, rendered impossible by quick-firing guns and shells, has given place to the manœuvre of isolated sharpshooters, who shelter themselves behind such cover as the field of action affords.

There has as yet been no experience to show the effect of this revolution in the art of war;* military men themselves cannot imagine what a war would be between two great European powers. But the idea of it is so frightful that it is enough to keep every government from taking the responsibility of it. The progress of the art of war has made war so hideous that no one dares to bring it on. The chemistry of explosives has worked in favour of peace.

In domestic policy the new arms have assured to the governments an irresistible force. No insurrection can be improvised now with chance weapons or by plundering the gunshops. A battle is impossible between sporting guns and military guns; no barricade can resist the new cannon. It is surely not a mere coincidence that revolutions and insurrections, so frequent in Europe until 1848, should have entirely ceased since the transformation in arms. A German socialist, Bebel, gave this explanation in 1890: "I have already told what the result of a revolution would be, carried on by 200,000 men at most, in this epoch of repeating guns and Maxim cannon; we should be miserably shot down like sparrows."

There is no longer any way to overturn a legal government, not even to defend a constitution against the executive power. The civil population has lost its only effective means of resistance to abuse of power by the government.

The art of revolutionary attempts has also been transformed by explosives. The old-fashioned "infernal machine," such as that used against Louis Philippe, has been replaced by dynamite bombs (Tsar Alexander in 1881). These terrifying methods have given isolated individuals a means of forcing public attention and taking on the appearance of a party; they have not added to the real power of the revolutionary parties, and have

*The transformation was only just beginning at the time of the Franco-Prussian War in 1870. The Russo-Turkish War of 1877 and the Servo-Bulgarian War of 1885 employed only semi-European armies, ill trained and ill equipped.

probably lessened their chances of success. Popular indignation is excited by their destructive explosions, and in the troubled mind of the public all the revolutionary parties are held jointly responsible.

New Methods of Communication.—The revolution in methods of communication has transformed political life by three direct means: the telegraph, railroads, and newspapers.

One of the political difficulties in government had always lain in the slowness of communication; to issue an order from the central authority, to receive a report from local agents, the old means of transportation, courier or ship, were so slow that often an order did not arrive in time to be carried out. This weakened the influence of the central authority or even made it powerless: an ill-defined power had to be intrusted to the local agents, and even the diplomatic agents in distant countries had to be practically left to their own discretion. All hope of receiving information from these agents in season to exercise any control over them had to be given up.

Aërial telegraphy, as invented by Chappe, was regarded as a great advance, but it could transmit only a few messages and only on a clear day. Electrical telegraphy, established after 1850, enabled governments to keep themselves informed and to take instantaneous action at any distance. The effect was quickly felt in diplomacy, where the government, informed of the smallest episodes, assumed the management of all affairs, and reduced its agents to mere instruments of transmission. In domestic affairs the telegraph has greatly quickened the relations between government and agent, although there still exist in administration many survivals of the period before telegraphy was introduced, in the form of writings which have now become useless but which the governments have forgotten to suppress. The telegraph, by strengthening the action of the central power, has increased centralization.

Railroads have revolutionized the postal system, an institution of long standing, but hampered by difficulty in transmission; it has now at its disposal a means of transportation which allows indefinite increase in the volume of mail-matter and a wonderful decrease in the cost of postage. There were in Europe, in 1890, according to the statistics of the international postal service, 90,000 post offices, and they had handled 10,000,000,000 letters and packages. The railroads, roads, and post offices, by facilitating the movements of persons and letters, have greatly pro-

moted all branches of public service and political life. They have permitted the establishment of an administration which, by regular and continuous action, reaches the inhabitants of the most remote districts. They have caused the disappearance of the oases of barbarism which were preserved in Europe, even in the heart of the most civilized countries. The police system, organized everywhere on the model of the French *gendarmerie*, has finally succeeded, thanks to the network of roads, in suppressing highway robbery in Europe, even in the forest and mountain districts.

All the inhabitants have entered into public life by regular relations with the agents of justice, taxation, military recruiting, and administration. The new means of communication have brought the government close to those who pay its taxes or need the attention of its courts and administrative officers. Their relations have thus been made at once more efficacious and less onerous. The improved communications have also been of advantage to the political parties by facilitating the propagation of doctrine and the presence of their leaders at their gatherings all over the country.

The press has been revolutionized by machinery,—the steam press made in 1814 for the English *Times*, the composing machine, then the rotary press; these, by lessening the time necessary for the mechanical work, permit the production of an enormous number of copies in a very short time and at slight expense.* The daily political newspaper, which was a luxury reserved for *subscribers* of the middle class, has reached the masses as *buyers* of single copies. The governments systematically attempted to keep the papers from reaching the multitude, first by the stamp duty, contrived in England in the eighteenth century; then by the deposit-pledge, invented in France in 1819; or by a tax on paper. These fiscal devices were aided by prosecutions against the press and suppression through administrative channels, which during the reaction against the revolution of 1848 produced a very noticeable effect on the sale of papers. But the cheap newspaper, in spite of the hostility of the governments, has finally effected a definite entrance into the life of all Europe.†

* To show this reduction in time an American has calculated that what may now be done in one hour would formerly have taken 100 days (72,000 sheets).

† Complete figures for calculating this progression are wanting; but the yearly circulation, which in the large countries was counted by millions, is

Now the daily paper, by its incomparable powers of reaching the masses, is in modern society the instrument of publicity, not only for commerce, but for politics. For acts of government, laws, orders, and judicial decrees, the old methods of publishing by proclamation, posted notice, and announcement in the churches, have been replaced by insertion in the newspapers. The newspaper has made it useless to forbid the publication of ecclesiastical acts, and needless to use the right of petition, formerly one of the fundamental liberties. But everywhere the newspaper influences public opinion in two ways: it reports and discusses the acts of the government and also of its agents, thus furnishing the only effectual means of protest against abuse of power; it expounds and spreads opinions, the necessary condition for the formation of political parties.

As long as the newspaper was a luxury for the wealthy, the middle class had a monopoly of politics, control, and opposition; the rest of the population came into political life only by riots. A cheap press made it possible to introduce into this inert mass a current of propagandism and opposition, which aroused the political life of the people and started the evolution of politics in the direction of democracy.

Adding to the direct transformations of political life the minor services rendered to the cause of good order by the lighting of the streets and the photographing of dangerous persons, I think we have the complete list of direct changes in political conditions. The indirect transformations are more numerous, but less evident; it is hardly possible here to indicate any but the most important and the least contestable.

Transformation in Population.—The progress in industrial arts has produced an increase in the means of subsistence which has certainly contributed to the rapid and continuous growth of population all over Europe. The almost exact census organized by the governments permits a measurement of its importance. The population of Europe, estimated in 1800 at about 180,000,000, to-day exceeds 350,000,000.* The growth has been principally now counted by hundreds of millions; the production has increased more than a hundredfold.

* The following table gives the comparative density per square kilometre, about one-third of a square mile, in 1820 and 1890:

Germany, 50	91	England and Wales,	80	192
Austria, 47	79	France, . . .	56	71
	54	Italy, . . .	64	107
Belgium, 138 (in 1840)	206			

in the northern countries. The increase in the number of inhabitants does not necessarily influence political life in itself. There are now in the Orient, and perhaps were in the Middle Ages, very dense and very inert masses of population; the United States, with a density of 7 inhabitants, has a much more intense political life than British India, with its density of 88. The political importance of the increase of population in the nineteenth century has been confined chiefly to what it has done for the cities everywhere.

The cities in 1814 were hardly more than centres of supplies and administration for the landlords and peasants of the region; the majority of them were inhabited by small groups of office-holders, artisans, and tradesmen, and were placed, at wide intervals, among a rural population; very few exceeded a population of 50,000. The new industries, by bringing workmen together in thousands, and steam transportation, by creating an enormous international commerce all over the world, have given rise to a new population of workingmen and commercial employees. The old cities have grown with unprecedented rapidity; manufacturing villages have become large cities.* In certain manufacturing districts, notably in England, Germany, and Belgium, the population has become so dense as to almost cover the land. The proportion of the city population to the whole has increased, in France, from 24 per cent. in 1846 to 36 per cent. in 1886. England, the first country to enter upon this evolution, had already, in 1851, a city population of 51 per cent., and in 1890 79 per cent.

Now, the history of the nineteenth century shows the large cities and manufacturing districts all over Europe to have been centres of revolution and of opposition to the government and clergy; it is they particularly that have recruited the democratic parties. The increase in city population has certainly been one of the material conditions in the general evolution of Europe toward democracy.

Increase in Wealth.—Machinery, by bringing to the service of industry the unlimited forces of nature, has led to the production of a much greater number of objects in a shorter space of time,

* In 1880 there were in Europe 4 cities with a population exceeding 1,000,000; 6 between 1,000,000 and 500,000; 25 between 500,000 and 200,000; 40 between 200,000 and 100,000; in all 178 exceeding 50,000. The total population of the great cities exceeding 500,000 was 11,000,000; in 1890 it exceeded 14,000,000.

and consequently has caused goods to be sold at much lower prices.* Steam transportation has permitted Europe to import at low prices the raw materials and agricultural products of the whole world, while at the same time her own agriculture has been growing more productive by underdraining, rotation of crops, chemical fertilizers, and intensive cultivation. A parallel increase in the production of gold and silver has for a long time prevented a corresponding fall in prices.† But the increase in production and the increase in money have worked together, increasing the abundance of useful objects and the ease of procuring them. This is shown in two ways: increased consumption of goods and increased accumulation of capital.

The increase in comforts of life has been so rapid and has so profoundly altered social habits that it is difficult to imagine the simple life of the beginning of the century. The luxury of the wealthy has become almost a burden. But everywhere the increase in commodities has penetrated to the masses and relieved their condition. Many things that were formerly luxuries have become articles of general use: sugar, coffee, chocolate, linen, cotton and silk stuffs, wall-paper, ready-made clothing, furniture, windows, dishes, candles and lamps, books, newspapers, music, theatres, and pictures.

By a parallel evolution, filthy ways of living, which in the eighteenth century prevailed among all classes in all countries, have become a reproach among civilized people and no longer exist in Europe except in the south and east or in the poorest portion of the community. Cleanliness of body, linen, house, and food tend to become a moral obligation and begin to be spread by the schools into the remotest parts of the country. Public cleanliness comes with personal cleanliness; street sweeping, sewers, and drains, almost unknown in 1814, have become indispensable institutions in all the cities. A public feeling of

* The saving in labour and time varies greatly according to the industry. Taking as a measure the number of workmen which would have been formerly necessary to manufacture the quantity produced to-day by a single workman, the following estimates by experts give some idea of the difference:

Boots,	5 for 1		Weaving,	30 for 1
Hats,	6 "		Spinning,	1100 "
Printing,	about 1000 for 1				

†The great development of deposit banking, and the use of cheques and bank notes instead of coin, have perhaps done as much to prevent a fall of prices as has the increased production of the precious metals.

disgust and shame has compelled the clearing away of the infected dwellings and alleys in which the poor of the great cities had been allowed to bury themselves.

The manual labourer of to-day has as many opportunities for enjoyment and mental culture, as much refinement in his surroundings, as the lower middle class had in 1814. Also, he has been enabled to take part in politics without causing the reaction of barbarism which men of experience predicted and which seemed an invincible argument against universal suffrage.

Only a part of the abundance produced by the new industrial system has been consumed; the rest has become savings. It is impossible to express by figures the savings accumulated since 1814, even in a single country; * the estimates rest on a too uncertain and varying basis of conjectural reasoning. But it is certain that it represents a capital at least double the sum of the capital left by all past centuries. Of this new capital a part has served to buy the new stock of tools for manufacture and commerce, and is represented by the railroads and factories; the rest has been lent to the governments for war and armament, and is represented by government bonds.† This enormous mass of disposable capital has revolutionized the financial conditions of government; it has made possible an increase of taxation, expenditure, and debts in proportions which would formerly have seemed intolerable. It has also made it easy to undertake a war on credit and to pass on the debt to future generations. Thus have increased the economic power of the government and the influence of the representative assemblies invested with the management of these enormous budgets.

Transformation of Economic Life.—The quicker and cheaper methods of transportation have produced a revolution in the economic activity of civilized nations. Formerly, the labouring classes produced hardly enough for their own consumption or for the local market; the peasants did little selling and almost no buying; artisans laboured only for local clients. The larger industry of the time, and even the foreign commerce, were con-

* Mulhall estimates the whole savings of England, from 1815 to 1880, at \$17,000,000,000, and the annual savings of the world at about \$2,400,000,000.

† England's debt was already formed in 1814, amounting in 1820 to \$4,200,000,000, and has since decreased. But for the whole of Europe national debts have increased from \$6,800,000,000 in 1820 to \$20,400,000,000 in 1881. The annual expenses of the central governments for all Europe have increased from \$1,000,000,000 in 1830 to \$3,000,000,000 in 1881.

fined almost entirely to articles of luxury made in certain factories and colonial products from over the sea. In the nineteenth century, by an evolution already begun in England between 1789 and 1814, producers, and even cultivators, have come to work no more for themselves or even for known customers, but only for the market, and not now the local market, but the market of the world.

The system of joint stock companies has developed rapidly in its application to large industrial enterprises, while the issues of government bonds have increased with the rapid increase of loans. Thus has been created an enormous quantity of new personal property, easily passed from one holder to another, and therefore forming a favourite subject of speculation.

The management of production has thus passed into the control of groups of speculators who direct the world's market, settle prices, order the goods to be produced, and determine the values of stocks and government bonds. The Commercial Exchange and the Stock Exchange have become the directing centres of the economic life of nations.*

This new power has effected a profound change in political conditions. The new aristocracy of personal wealth, bankers, manufacturers, and merchants, though held at arm's length by the old landed aristocracy, has made a place for itself in politics, by furnishing the mainstay of the liberal parties, and trying to guide the democratic mass of the nation. Lucrative industrial enterprises and large speculations depended directly on the state, in its action touching customs duties, loans, and concessions of public works; they depended indirectly on the press, by reason of its power of publicity. The financial aristocracy has tried to gain ascendancy over the government, the legislative bodies, and the press. In what measure it has succeeded in the different countries of Europe is still a secret history which I have not attempted to relate. But the power of speculation over the political rulers of the states has certainly been one of the characteristics of the political life of the nineteenth century.

*The importance of the Stock Exchange is shown in the number of stocks of all sorts quoted on Exchange:

1815.	London, . . .	30	Paris, . . .	15	Berlin, . . .	11
1877.	" . . .	1307	" . . .	553	" . . .	613

BIBLIOGRAPHY.

BIBLIOGRAPHY.—See “*Handwörterbuch der Staatswissenschaften*,” 1890-94, and the 1895 supplement to the words *Borse*, *Eisenbahnen*, *Eisen*, *Gold*, *Anleihen*, *Staatsschulden*, *Silber*, *Telegraphie*, etc., where the bibliography of each question is given.—See also **W. Cunningham**, “*The Growth of English Industry and Commerce . . .*”

WORKS.—I am not acquainted with the complete scientific history of modern inventions. Many of the details are given in the popular works: **Figuier**, “*Les Merveilles de la Science*”; “*L’année Scientifique*” (published annually since 1855); “*Das Neue Buch der Erfindungen . . .*,” 6 vols., 1864-67.

For comparative statistics of wealth and population: **Kolb**, “*Handbuch der Vergleichenden Statistik*,” 1st edit., 1857, 8th edit., 1879 (Eng. translation, “*Condition of Nations*,” 1880), the most reliable work of this kind.—**Mulhall**, “*Dictionary of Statistics*,” new edit., 1886; handy, but unreliable.

C. D. Wright, “*The Industrial Evolution of the United States*,” 1895, an intelligent sketch of the industrial history of the world in its relation to the United States.

For the evolution in France: **Rambaud**, “*Hist. of Modern Civilization in France*,” 1888.—For England: **W. Cunningham**, “*Growth of English Industry and Commerce . . .*,” 1892, very instructive, indicating special histories of commerce (**Levi**, **Yeats**,) and the different trades (**Baines**, cotton; **Bischoff**, woollens, etc.).

CHAPTER XXIII.

THE CHURCH AND THE CATHOLIC PARTIES.

The Church before the Revolution.—The political history of the Catholic Church in the nineteenth century is the history of the relations between Church authority and lay authorities.* To understand the conflicts which have filled the century, one must know how the question stands between the governments and the clergy, and what powers they dispute. But it is hardly possible to realize the position of the clergy in contemporary society without reviewing the organization of the Church before the Revolution.

The principle of all Christian nations since the Middle Ages was that all Christian society must obey at once two authorities: the lay sovereign governs the body, the church sovereign the soul; they share the power and mutually support each other. The right of governing souls implies, to enforce obedience, a material power; so the Church demanded a share of public authority.

The Church had need of absolute independence to fulfil its divine mission. It must therefore, like the state, form a body capable of being sufficient to itself, what is called a "complete society" (*societas perfecta*). It had its organization parallel with that of the state: its sovereign power (the Pope and council), its officials (the clergy organized in a hierarchical body), its laws and its legal principles, decreed by itself (the canons and canon

*The technical term for these is *relations of church and state*. A Church history would give an opportunity to study the relations of the different churches with the state in the various countries of Europe. The Protestant and Orthodox Greek churches, being national churches subordinated to the lay sovereign, have no common political history. There may be from one country to another personal relations and sympathies between the members of the same church; but there is no international Protestant or Orthodox *party*, because these churches have no general organization. The Catholic Church alone, being universal, forms an international body directed by a single head, independent of all the governments. Its members, whose bond of union is superior to the dividing lines of states, are grouped in international Catholic parties.

law), its ecclesiastical courts, its procedure and its prisons, its domains and its taxes (the tithes); it had the power to give commands and inflict punishments on its subjects.

All laymen were members of the Church and subject to the clergy in religious matters. The clergy regulated matters of faith, worship, and morals; they prescribed all that laymen should believe, say, and do, and their orders were obligatory. They dispensed the sacraments with a sovereign hand, including marriage, one of the chief acts of private life. They kept the registers of births and deaths. They directed schools and education, hospitals, and public charities. They supervised speech and writings and subjected publications to their censorship.

The practice of religion, being an obligation of public interest, must be imposed on all laymen, even by force, just as respect for decency and good order was imposed on them. As the Church has no physical means of constraint, the state lent its strength. The clergy decreed the religious duties to be imposed on the faithful, denounced omissions, and pronounced condemnations. The government offered its services in enforcing decisions; it forced the monks and nuns to fulfil their vows; it forced laymen to obey the clergy, to practice their religion regularly, to attend the services, to fast, to confess, to be married and buried by the clergy, and to have their children instructed in religious matters. It forbade the books condemned by Church censorship, and executed the judgments of the Church courts.

In every Catholic country there existed a compact between Church and state, with three conditions: 1. independent organization of the clergy; 2. power of the clergy to issue orders to all laymen; 3. assistance of the lay government in maintaining Church authority. In this *régime* members of the clergy were free from lay authority; the government could not impose on clerks any temporal charge, either tax or military service—not even the obligation to appear before its courts. On the contrary, members of the government, as members of the Church, were subject to the religious authority of the clergy; they must place themselves at its service to carry out its orders. The division of power into *spiritual* and *temporal* did not even assure to the lay power a share of independent sovereignty, for the clergy alone drew the dividing lines between the two domains and decided which affairs belonged within its own. Thus the clergy gave orders, but received none. It was the theory formulated by Boniface in the bull *Unam Sanctam*: Christ has instituted two

swords—the one spiritual, belonging to the Church, the other temporal, belonging to the princes; but the princes must wield their sword according to the wish of the Pope; it is a Manichean heresy to recognise an independent lay power side by side with the ecclesiastical power, for every human being is subject to the Pontiff. The Church is superior to the state.

In practice, however, laymen had imposed an inverse system on the Church. The government, even in the states which had remained Catholic, had subordinated the Church to the state.* The clergy no longer form an independent body; they are subject to lay taxes and courts. They have no longer their self-governing organization; the prelates, heads of the clergy, are chosen by the lay government. They have not retained even their sovereignty in religious matters; the government has imposed on them a supervision which is expressed in similar forms throughout the great Catholic states: the *placet*, the government authorization required before publishing any decision by the Church authorities; the *exequatur*, the government confirmation necessary for the execution of an order; the *recursus ab abusu*, the right of the lay courts to break through an ecclesiastical sentence.

This system did not do away with compulsory Church authority; the state continued to force its subjects to practice religion and obey the clergy. But in a number of states the religious contests which followed the Reformation had led to compromises contradictory to the fundamental principle of the Catholic Church, unity of faith. The government permitted laymen to substitute the practice of another religion for that of Catholicism; Catholic believers remained subject to clerical authority, while non-Catholics were exempt from it. This system took two forms: *Toleration*, or “private exercise of religion,” maintained the superiority of the State Church and simply *tolerated* the other religions in an inferior position; this was the system which had prevailed in Austria since Joseph II., and in France since Louis XVI. *Parity*, practised in the German states and in Hun-

*In Protestant as well as Orthodox states, the sovereign has become the official head of the Church; this is *Cesaropapism*. The Reformation did not establish liberty of conscience; but in breaking up the Church it established little churches too weak to maintain their authority, churches in which the clergy have become the servants of the lay power. The government, subject to the absolute will of the lay sovereign, has gradually become indifferent to religion and has finally become a lay state. In this sense the Reformation prepared the way for revolution.

gary, consisted in maintaining several state churches side by side, equally supported by the government, and each obligatory for its own members (this system was combined with toleration for unrecognised creeds). Spain and Italy alone preserved Catholic unity and official intolerance.* The others had adopted the system of toleration and superiority of the lay power.

Meanwhile the governments, to make the Catholic clergy still more dependent on the lay sovereign, had diminished the authority of the ecclesiastical sovereign, the Pope. A number of Catholic states even attempted to establish a national Church, joined to the universal Church by the ties of a common faith, but with a distinct national organization and its own particular form of liturgy; examples are the *Gallican* Church in France, the doctrine of Febronius in Germany, and in Austria *Josephism*.

Thus, from the period of "enlightened despotism" the Church preserved its privileges, estates, and endowments, exemption from military service for the clergy, special system of taxation, and pre-eminence marked by honours and precedence in ceremonies; it even retained an effective authority, supervision over the conduct of laymen, censorship of books, the control of marriage and records of vital statistics. It was still a system of collaboration between government and clergy. But the churchmen had descended to the rank of officials under the lay power. The Pope alone, at once the head of the Church and a temporal prince, remained an independent sovereign and maintained in the Catholic Church an independent spiritual authority, at least in matters of faith and worship. His political influence, however, was weakened.

The Revolution in the Church.—The old church system, greatly shaken by the Reformation, was overturned by the Revolution. The Republican party, which controlled the French Convention of 1792 and the Directory, adopted a radical solution already tried in the United States. They established the exclusive preponderance of the lay power in society, and systematically destroyed all that remained of the official Church institution, all the powers of the clergy over the faithful in matters of con-

*The Protestant countries were divided in like manner between these three systems: England and the Netherlands had tolerance and Prussia parity, while the Scandinavian countries tolerated none but the Lutheran Church. The Orthodox countries retained in principle compulsory religion and Church unity; in the Ottoman Empire the Sultan imposed the belief which it pleased him to recognise, and in the Russian Empire the Tsar had guaranteed the preservation of the Church of each country annexed.

duct, education, and civil records. The Revolution had deprived the Church of its courts, tithes, estates, all its honorary privileges, and even cancelled its religious vows. Religion became a purely personal matter, freed from all outside authority; the clergy lost all means of material constraint, even over Church members. All public institutions, marriage, registration, education, charity, and burials, were made independent of the Church; there remained nothing but lay power. This marks the complete separation of Church and state, the complete indifference of the government in religious matters, the absolute liberty and equality of all creeds—a system directly opposed to that of the Middle Ages.

Napoleon I. restored the system of “enlightened despotism” and the Gallican Church. By the Concordat with the Pope he recognised the Church as an official institution; he officially restored the clerical hierarchy and granted it its official honours, a state appropriation, exemption from military service, and the right of having colleges. But to this restored clergy he granted no authority over laymen, no control of civil records, no censorship, nor supervision of schools, no material power over its members, no compulsory vows nor means of coercion. He left them not even the internal liberty accorded to every private religious society where the separation of Church and state is established. He made them subject to the lay government as a body of office-holders, and revived the old royal powers over the Gallican Church. This was the Gallican Church, with all its subjection to lay authority, but without its authority over individuals.

Of the old church system Napoleon had restored only the forms and the supervising power of the lay government. Of the Revolution he preserved the fundamental principle, religious liberty and equality, and the withdrawal of all public authority from the clergy. For the government this was the system of “enlightened despotism,” for individuals it was the system of the Revolution. The form of the Concordat concealed this revolutionary character by recognising in the Church the right to treat with the state. But to this Concordat, concluded in the form of a treaty between two powers, Napoleon added the *organic articles*. These were simple laws, the exclusive work of the lay power, which, in spite of protests from the Pope, regulated, in a sense contrary to canon law, the “general relations of the Church with state laws and police.” They imposed on the Church the old forms of lay supremacy: appeal to the Council.

of State on questions of clerical powers, government authorization for publishing papal acts, for sending nuncios, holding councils, establishing festivals, and creating parishes.

The Concordat, or a similar system, was extended to all the states under the rule or influence of Napoleon, that is, all the Catholic states except Austria and Portugal. It overturned the organization of the Catholic Church in Europe and simplified the relations between Church and state. In all the countries, the Church, while fully preserving the character of an official state institution, was deprived of every means of constraint and treated as a dependency of the government. It was weakened at the same time by systematic secularizations, which abolished the old religious orders and Church estates; in Germany the lay princes suppressed the states of the ecclesiastical princes, with over 3,000,000 inhabitants, and divided them among themselves. Napoleon himself annexed the Papal States to his Empire.

The Restoration of the Church.—The Allies, after defeating Napoleon, restored the Papal States to the Pope, with the exception of Avignon. But this was the only ecclesiastical state that was restored. The Church, having been part of the old *régime*, had been overturned by the Revolution, but it was re-established by the Restoration. The restored lay sovereigns restored the Church organization. It was for them a conscientious duty to set up the legitimate Church again at the same time as the legitimate monarchy, and an act of conservative policy to restore the naturally conservative authority of the clergy. The Legitimists demanded "the union of throne and altar," the alliance of government and clergy. This was the theory of the legitimist school, Chateaubriand, de Maistre, Haller, and Schlegel; it was put in practice by the governments. The two powers, menaced by the Revolution, saw their common interest, and joined hands to fight the common enemy.

Relations between the two powers were, however, regulated in different ways. The Pope made full restoration in his states; he restored the convents that had been suppressed by the Revolution, and even, abandoning a decision that had been enforced by the former monarchies, restored the Jesuit Society, by a solemn bull,* in April, 1814, without consulting the governments.

* This society, abolished by the Pope in 1773, had in reality been perpetuated in non-Catholic states, Russia and Prussia, and under another name, *Fathers of the Faith*, in the Catholic states. It had already been re-established in the Kingdom of Sicily.

The absolutist monarchies of Spain and Portugal, and those of Italy, except for the Austrian provinces and Tuscany, also returned to the old ecclesiastical system. They restored unity of faith (compulsory Catholicism), Church courts, tithes, Church estates, religious orders, and clerical control of marriage and registration.

The two great Catholic monarchies preserved state control of the Church and religious liberty. Austria preserved *Josephism* with toleration, France the Napoleonic Concordat with equality of creeds. They restored neither compulsory unity of faith, nor independence of the Church; France did not even restore the religious orders nor the Church domains that the Revolution had destroyed. The Pope protested against the Charter,* an exclusively lay document in which there was no mention of the Catholic Church, "not even of the name of God"; against Article 22, which established "liberty of creed and conscience" and "promised protection to ministers of what are called the *denominations*," putting "on a level with heretical sects and even Jewish perfidy the Holy Spouse of Christ, the Church outside of which there could be no salvation"; against Article 23, on the press, "liberty which threatens morals and faith."

In Germany, the Church of the times before the Revolution was not restored; not only the ecclesiastical principalities, but the convents, remained suppressed. The plan of a single regulation for the whole Confederation fell through. A new Church with new districts was established by special agreement between the Pope and the government of each state. Bavaria alone gave to this agreement the form of a concordat (1817); it recognised in the Church the "rights and privileges which appertain to it by divine order and canon law," but the Concordat was promulgated with an edict similar to Napoleon's organic articles, which, in spite of the protests of the Pope, guaranteed religious liberty. In the other German states, the Church was organized by a series of papal bulls concerted with the governments. Everywhere the government preserved its power over the Church, and even continued, as in the eighteenth century, to interfere in the regulating of details in purely Church matters, liturgy, festivals, and pilgrimages.

The Restoration re-established only an impoverished and subordinated Church.

* This was really against the constitution drafted by the Senate, but the incriminated articles passed into the Charter. See p 231 for a similar protest against the constitution of the Kingdom of the Netherlands.

The Ultramontane Party.—From the crisis of the Revolution the Church emerged transformed in spite of herself. While everyone thought her enfeebled she found herself fortified. The clergy of the eighteenth century, with its aristocratic and imperfectly centralized constitution, had many privileges and apparent authority; yet it had little activity and little influence on society. The cultivated classes did not obey it, and over the masses its influence remained local, without unity of aim. Each great state had its National Church, practically almost independent of the Pope and subject to the government.

The bishops, those princes of the Church who were really lay nobles, and the old religious orders, holders of great estates, were swept away by the crisis. Instead of these instruments of aristocracy and decentralization, bishops of democratic origin, fresh from the seminaries, became the heads of the clergy; the religious orders of Roman origin were devoted to the Pope, especially the Jesuits, and they took charge of preaching and education. The seminaries were reorganized according to the decrees of the Council of Trent; the dogma of the supremacy of the Pope, taught to new generations, became once more the fundamental doctrine touching the organization of the Church.

The National Churches, established after the weakening of the papacy in the fourteenth century, and maintained in spite of the restoration effected by the Council of Trent, had still supporters who tried to resist this new restoration of the papal power; the governments supported them in contempt of the Pope. The conflict that divided the Catholics into two parties, national and pontifical, was especially sharp in France. The National Church there took the form of a doctrine, the "maxims of the Gallican Church" of 1682; Napoleon had declared these obligatory (the *organic articles*, among the "cases of abuse" of clerical authority, enumerated "attempts against the liberties, immunities, and customs of the Gallican Church"). The old struggle was reopened between the *Gallicans* and *Ultramontanes*. The Gallicans rested on the lay power. Even after the Restoration the King, the ministers, and the administrative staff remained Gallicans; churchmen in positions of control were Gallicans, the headmaster of Frayssinous University, the Superior of St. Suplice, the archbishops of Paris; the Jesuits were expelled, as supporters of papal sovereignty, and their order continued to be regarded as abolished, in spite of the Bull of 1814. But the Ultramontanes gradually won the mass of the clergy and

the faithful. A similar conflict and evolution, though less marked, occurred in Germany. The result was to replace the former aristocratic national clergy, half officials of the state, by a democratic clergy subject to an international ecclesiastical monarchy, the Papacy. The government of the Catholic world was definitely centralized at Rome. The Church had lost in wealth and official authority, but she gained in force of centralization. Meanwhile new orders were being established, and new convents, particularly of women; these, by means of legacies and gifts, began once more to build up ecclesiastical estates.

In Rome the Pope was struggling against his spiritual and temporal adversaries. Pius VII. condemned the Bible Societies which were spreading translations of the Bible. Leo XII. (1823-29) prosecuted particularly the secret societies: the *Carbonari*, who were labouring to establish Italian unity, and consequently to destroy the temporal power of the Pope; also the *Free Masons*, who attacked unity of the faith by demanding religious liberty. Then began that bitter contest between the Holy See and the Free Masons, which was to fill the nineteenth century with polemics.

The Liberal Catholic Party.—The constant tendency of the Catholic clergy had been to rest on authority in order to make the true religion obligatory and maintain *unity of faith*; the Pope's doctrine, formulated in his declarations, condemned liberty of religion and of the press. But Catholics were drawn into the movement toward liberalism which brought reforms and revolutions to England, Switzerland, France, and Belgium. About 1828 a new Liberal Catholic party appeared which tried to reconcile the new liberal doctrines with the traditional power of the Church. Instead of asking privileges for the clergy and government assistance against the opponents of their religion, they confined themselves to demanding for the Church that liberty of common law which the liberal system accorded to simple individuals, the right of association, the right to acquire property, to found educational and charitable institutions. The Church, in possession of the truth, had no need of coercive power; liberty would be sufficient to enable her to undertake the direction of society, through education, preaching, and the manifestation of her virtues and moral superiority.

The movement began in three countries, Ireland, Belgium, and France, whose governments, either Protestant or Gallican, allowed the Catholic clergy less liberty of action than the liberal

doctrine allowed to private associations, and where simple liberty for the Church represented an increase of power. The Liberal Catholics conducted the campaign simultaneously in the three countries; their leaders were in personal communication.

In Ireland, O'Connell, in the name of liberty, demanded and obtained (1829) the repeal of the Test Act and the admission of Catholics to civil equality. In Belgium the Liberal Catholics, in the name of liberty, aided in the revolt against Holland and secured the Constitution of 1831. This granted to the clergy complete liberty as in America, and at the same time preserved to them their privileges as in Europe. In France the party was merely a group of young men. Their leader, Abbé Lamennais, had protested against the expulsion of the Jesuits (1829): "We demand for the Catholic Church the liberty promised by the Charter to all religions, the liberty which is extended to Protestants and Jews. . . We want liberty of conscience, of the press, and of education, and that is what the Belgians, too, are demanding." Lacordaire demanded American liberty. The party was small and had no influence with the government, but it excited public opinion through its organ, the *Avenir*, founded in August, 1830, and by the declarations of Montalembert, peer of France. He demanded liberty of education, that is, the right to establish Catholic schools. Later they went on to reject the concordat, which gave the choice of bishops to the enemies of Catholicism, and to demand the separation of Church and state.

The Liberal Catholics, in accepting liberty, did not give up the direction of morals, education, and charities; but they declared that these things, not being within the domain of the state, must be cared for by the individual citizen, who had the right to hand over the control of them to the clergy. In the Church they recognised the supreme and absolute power of the Pope; they were *Ultramontanes*, opposed to the National Churches, although the ill-informed French public often made Liberal the synonym for Gallican and the opposite of Ultramontane. But the doctrine of liberty, as opposed to unity of the faith, was never accepted by the court of Rome. Gregory XVI. (1830-46) condemned the Belgian constitution as Pius VII. had condemned the French *Charte*, because it recognised liberty of religion and of the press; he condemned the Liberal Catholics of France in the encyclical *Mirari Vos* (August, 1832).*

* Among the "causes of the evils that afflict the Church" it specified *indifferentism*, or that perverse idea spread about through the dishonesty

In spite of the condemnation, the Liberal party took charge of the Catholic movement in the constitutional states, and continued to demand the liberties necessary to the Church.* The establishment of the constitutional monarchy in Portugal and in Spain destroyed practical unity of faith in those states and introduced actual toleration, secularized almost all the Church estates, and suppressed almost all the monasteries.

The Liberal movement appeared later in Italy, with the *risorgimento*; it took mainly the form of *clerico-liberal societies*, formed by priests to establish at once liberty and national unity. One of the writers of the *risorgimento*, Gioberti, was a priest. Pius IX., elected against the candidate of the Austrian party, passed for the Pope of the Liberal party, and his election at first seemed the definite triumph of the Liberal Catholics (1846).

The Catholic Democracy and the Revolution of 1848.—The Catholics began to feel the effects of a new political movement, the movement toward democracy, which ended in the revolutions of 1848. As before 1830 a Liberal Catholic party had been formed in all the states, so before 1848 a democratic Catholic

of wicked men that eternal salvation of the soul may be secured by a profession of any sort of faith, provided that one conforms in morals to the prevalent ideas of justice and decency. . . . From the fetid sources of this indifference flows that ridiculous and erroneous idea, or rather that madness, that we must procure and guarantee for everybody liberty of conscience, an error . . . for which the way is smoothed by that complete and immoderate freedom of opinion . . . out of which some, in an excess of imprudence, pretend that some good may come to religion. . . . With this is connected that liberty of the press, the worst of all, which can never be sufficiently execrated and cursed. . . . There are, however, men carried away by imprudence to the point of maintaining obstinately that the deluge of errors which arises from it is sufficiently compensated by some book that is published . . . for the defence of religion and truth. . . . Is it possible that a man of sense could say that . . . poisons should be put on public sale, because there are remedies which may snatch from death?" The Encyclical recalls the services rendered by the *Index* and condemns the doctrine of those who not only reject censorship of books . . . but go so far as to declare that it is contrary to the principles of justice and dare to refuse to the Church the right to establish and enforce it." Then, recalling the disastrous revolutions produced by heretics, it adds: "We cannot expect happier results for religion and the lay power from the desires of those who wish to separate Church and state and break the union of priesthood and empire, for it is an established fact that lovers of unbridled liberty dread this union, which has always been salutary both for Church and state."

* See for Ireland p. 54, for Belgium p. 245, for France p. 49.

party was formed in the democratic countries. It began where the democratic revolution had been first made, in the Catholic cantons of Switzerland. It was an Ultramontane party, attached to the sovereignty of the Pope; at Freiburg it enlisted the Jesuits; at Lucerne, when it had obtained possession of the government, it submitted the new constitution of the canton for the approval of Gregory XVI. It was a party of unity of the faith, hostile to the doctrine of religious liberty. But, while preserving the old doctrines, it adopted new lines of action which practically changed the relations of the clergy with the political body, in countries where Catholicism is not the state religion. The Church, without theoretically condemning any form of government, had hardly ever actually allied itself except with princes and aristocracies. Its own organization is a monarchical hierarchy, in which all authority comes from above, by virtue of a mystical right, and is exercised without control over a body of subjects. In the democratic republics of Switzerland, based on the sovereignty of the people and government by elective officers, the authority was, on the contrary, delegated from below. Between these two opposing systems the Catholic party found a practical reconciliation. The representatives of the sovereign people, masters by election of the sovereign lay power, subjected themselves voluntarily, as Catholics, to the sovereign spiritual power of the Pope and left him judge of the limits between the two powers. In this system of revolutionary origin, the Church recovered indirectly a higher authority than in the monarchies; for the Pope, instead of having to treat with an hereditary sovereign, accustomed to command, found only submissive sons of the Church, accustomed to obey. He became once more the supreme arbiter in settling the relations between Church and state.

But to make good this new power, the old means of ecclesiastical influence were no longer sufficient. Democratic processes must be adopted: electoral and parliamentary organization, and the press; parliamentary Catholic parties were organized, Catholic committees and Catholic newspapers were established. Then began also new difficulties. The majority of Catholic members and journalists were laymen. This was a new power in the direction of Catholic interests; between them and the official heads of the Church, bishops and priests, rivalries in influence and divergencies in opinion led to conflicts of a new sort. The Pope, called upon to end them by his sovereign authority, was

to be led to interfere more and more in the current politics of Catholic countries and to take the part of a leader of a political party.

This democratic evolution was suddenly accelerated by the revolutions of 1848. These were lay and democratic revolutions, made in the name of the lay sovereignty of the people and absolute liberty, usually with a sentiment of good-will for the clergy. They did not destroy the institutions of the Church, but they proclaimed the principle of the complete liberty of creed and tended to laicize public institutions. In France, where the state was already completely lay, the official organization of the Church remained the same, but universal suffrage gave the clergy a political influence which became the most active force of the Conservative party. In Italy the governments were content to set up the principle of religious liberty, and Catholicism remained the privileged state religion. In the German countries the revolution introduced the Belgian system of Church liberty. The Frankfort Parliament adopted an article which passed finally into the Constitution of Prussia: "Every religious society regulates and administers its affairs in an independent manner, but remains . . . subject to the laws of the state." The German bishops met at Wurzburg in October, 1848, and demanded the abolition of the subjection imposed on the Church (*placet*, prohibition of correspondence with the Holy See, appeal to the courts against clerical decrees). The revolution in Prussia and Austria resulted in abolishing the *placet* and state supervision. In the other German states the regulations were made only slowly, in the midst of complicated conflicts.

Reaction in the Church.—The Revolution of 1848 made a deep impression on Pius IX.; he consented to liberty granted under a paternal government, but his subjects wanted to impose on him a constitutional liberty and to limit his power legally. He broke with the Liberal party. Driven from Rome by the revolutionists, he returned a partisan of the absolutist system, determined to fight the revolution with the aid of the governments, and convinced that the temporal power of the Pope was the necessary barrier against revolution.*

* The Encyclical *Nostis et Nobiscum* to the bishops of Italy (December 8, 1849), after condemning *socialism* and *communism*, declares that "the successor of Peter, the Roman Pontiff, possesses supreme authority (*primatum*) over the whole world; he is the true vicar of Christ, head of the whole Church, father and teacher of all Christians. The easiest way

In all the states, the revolution was followed by a reaction; the lay governments, as after the Restoration, made alliance with the Church authorities and by a more methodical alliance than in 1814. The socialist movement of 1848 had alarmed the middle-classes and decided them to appeal to the Conservative power of the clergy.* Irreligion, which had gone out of fashion among the nobility after the Revolution of 1793, went out of fashion in the middle classes after the Revolution of 1848; in all the Catholic countries † religion became, and has remained, a worldly obligation, a part of good education and the fashion of good society. The Catholic party used these conditions to increase the power of the clergy. In France it secured the liberty of secondary education and Catholic primary schools (1850). Later, under Napoleon III., it gained the favour of the government. In Prussia the state resigned to the bishops the control of their clergy and their colleges (see p. 491). In the small German states a series of long and complicated negotiations succeeded in establishing a similar system. In Austria the Holy See secured the abandonment of Josephism in 1850, then the Concordat of 1855, the first in which the government of a great state recognised that the Church held its rights, not as a concession from the lay power, but "by divine institution and canon law." State criminal juris-

to keep the nations in the profession of the Catholic faith is to keep them in the communion and in obedience to the Pope. The modern enemies of God and of human society also do their utmost to draw away the Italian peoples from obedience to us." As for the princes, "they see that the diminution of the authority of the bishops and the increasing contempt for divine and Church precepts that are violated with impunity have equally diminished the obedience of the people to lay authority and opened to the enemies of public peace an easier means of inciting sedition against the prince. They also see that by seizing, confiscating, and publicly selling temporal property lawfully belonging to the Church, respect for property consecrated to a religious purpose has been weakened among the people, who are thus disposed to listen more readily to the partisan of *socialism* and *communism*, threatening to seize and divide or make common other forms of property."

* Louis Veillot, director of the Catholic paper the *Univers*, thus formulated the policy of Thiers, head of the Orleanist-Catholic coalition: "He would like to-day to fortify the party of smug and thorough-going revolutionists, of which he is the leader, by a body of gendarmes in cassocks, on account of the manifest insufficiency of the others."

† A similar evolution has taken place in the Protestant countries, especially in England. In the Orthodox countries of eastern Europe, religious indifference has remained the fashion in cultivated society.

diction over the clergy was represented simply as a concession from the Pope "out of consideration for the conditions of the time." A similar concordat had been concluded in Spain in 1851. Meanwhile the Pope secured the right to institute officially bishoprics and ecclesiastical districts in the Protestant countries—in England in 1850, and in Holland in 1853. Throughout Europe the period of reaction from 1849 to 1859 was used to increase the power of the Catholic parties in almost all the countries. The Kingdom of Sardinia alone has, since 1850, undertaken to laicize her institutions and enter into open conflict with the Holy See (see p. 348).

In addition to these partial restorations, Pius IX. laboured to effect a general restoration of Catholic society, according to the plan indicated in his official acts and commented on by his official organ, the *Civiltà Cattolica* (Catholic Civilization), founded in 1850. He began with an act of doctrinal sovereignty proclaiming the Immaculate Conception of the Virgin, the favourite doctrine of the Franciscans and Jesuits, but rejected by the Dominicans. After asking the advice of the bishops and receiving 576 answers, almost all affirmative, he solemnly promulgated the dogma in the Sistine chapel on the 8th of December—a day chosen for a mystical reason and ever afterward consecrated to the great acts of his pontificate. He promulgated it without a meeting of the council by virtue of his pontifical authority, thus affirming the right of the Pope to define, by his own act, the faith of the Catholic Church (1854).

He then called together a congregation to prepare a complete exposition of his doctrine on the rôle of the Church in modern society and to draw up the catalogue of contemporary errors; it worked five years, and made the plan which served as the doctrinal manifesto of 1864.

While Pius IX. was preparing his doctrinal exposition, the Sardinian government established the Kingdom of Italy, deprived the Pope of a part of his states, and announced its intention of making Rome the capital of the new kingdom. Pius IX. treated the annexation of the States of the Church as a robbery. The destruction of the temporal power, even though accomplished by a monarchy, was to him a most shocking case of *Revolution*. He thought himself back in 1848, all the more so because the Italian monarchical government worked in harmony with the revolutionists of 1848, with Garibaldi, one of the triumvirs of the Roman Republic. Pius IX. therefore condemned the new *Revo-*

lution and excommunicated all those who had "taken part in the criminal invasion of his provinces.*

The Encyclical "Quanta Cura" and the Syllabus (1864).—When France, by the September Convention, consented to withdraw the troops which defended the Pope at Rome, Pius IX., indignant, decided to publish his plan for the reconstruction of society, December 8, 1864. He gave it the form of an encyclical to Christendom, followed by a "catalogue (syllabus) of modern errors" which he had previously condemned.

The *Quanta Cura* set forth in definite form the fundamental conception of the Pope, already explained in the *Civiltà Cattolica*: Catholic civilization, so prosperous during the Middle Ages, had been successively enfeebled by Lutheranism, Jansenism, Voltairanism, and socialism; society has been organized in a heterodox spirit, it must be reconstructed from the bottom on legitimate authority.

The Encyclical began by recalling the fact that the office of the Pope is to preserve the faithful from heresies and errors. Pius IX. had already condemned "the principal errors of our most unhappy epoch" (*tristissimæ nostræ ætatis*), and "the monstrous opinions which predominate everywhere in our time . . . and from which almost all the other errors have their origin."

The fundamental error is "naturalism" (*naturalismus*), the idea "that the best organization of government and civil progress demand absolutely that human society shall be constituted and governed without taking any more account of religion than if it did not exist, or at least without making a distinction between

* The apostolical letter of March 26, 1860, expounds the doctrine of the temporal power. "The Catholic Church, founded by Christ, . . . has secured by virtue of her divine institution the form of a perfect society; she should, therefore, enjoy so full liberty that in the exercise of her sacred ministry she should never be subjected to any lay power. It is therefore by a special decree of Providence, that the Pope, established by Christ as the head and centre of his whole Church, has acquired the temporal power. The divine wisdom has willed that in such a crowd of temporal princes the Sovereign Pontiff shall enjoy that political authority which is necessary to the exercise of his spiritual power, authority, and jurisdiction. It was agreed that the Catholic world should have no occasion to suspect that this See can be, as head of the Church universal, influenced by the temporal powers or drawn away by parties." A letter of 1863 condemns churchmen who "attack the temporal power of the Holy See" and "dare to establish wholly objectionable societies called Clerical Liberals, Mutual Aid, Deliverer of the Italian Clergy, (*clerico-liberali, Di mutuo soccorso, Emancipatrice del clero italiano*)."

the true religion and false religions; further, "that the best system is that in which the government is not empowered to visit punishment on violators of the Catholic religion except so far as the public may require." (The idea that the government must be founded on natural motives and remain a stranger to religion is really historically the foundation of the English constitutional system and of the modern lay state; it has resulted in withdrawing from the clergy every means of material constraint, leaving them only a moral authority. It is contrary to the *unity of faith*, the fundamental doctrine of the Church. It implies the mental reservation that the different religions * are of sufficiently equal value to make it possible to leave each man to choose one for himself.)

"From this absolutely false idea of society and government" arises the error, "set down as *madness* by Gregory XVI.," that "liberty of conscience and of creed is the right of every man, and may be proclaimed and admitted into every well-constituted society, and that citizens are entitled to full liberty of publishing and maintaining their opinions through the press or otherwise without restraint from any civil or ecclesiastical authority." Now, this is "a fatal liberty, for if free discussion of human opinion is always allowed, there will always be people who dare to resist the truth." (Liberty of conscience and of the press is in fact irreconcilable with *unity of faith*; historically it was first established in countries torn by religious revolutions.)

When "religion has been discarded from civil society . . . the idea of justice and law" is lost; the immediate consequence is that "the will of the people, as manifested by public opinion or any other means, constitutes the supreme law independently of every divine and human right, and that in political order accomplished facts . . . have the force of law." It is thus that the religious orders were abolished. After religion had been driven out of society, it was to be excluded from the family, by civil marriage and lay schools. (It is a fact that the sovereignty of the people has not been historically admitted except in those countries which no longer recognise the sovereignty of the Church; it has led to civil marriage and neutrality of the public school.)

* The errors of *indifferentism* and latitudinarianism are mentioned in the Syllabus in these terms: "Man may in the creed of any religion find the road to eternal salvation and secure eternal salvation. Every man is free to embrace and to profess the religion which he believes to be true, conducted by the light of reason."

In political matters it is an "error to say that the supreme authority intrusted by Christ to the Church and the Holy See is subject to civil authority, and to deny all the rights of the Church and the Holy See in those things which belong to the outside world," by declaring that "the Papal Acts and decrees relative to religion and the Church must have the consent of the civil power, and that the Church has not the right to visit those who violate its laws with temporal punishments.* This régime rests on "the heretical principle" that "the ecclesiastical power is not, by divine law, distinct and independent of the civil power." (This is in fact the principle of the Protestant states and of *Cæsaro-papism*. The "Catholic dogma" is, on the contrary, that "the full power was divinely conferred by Christ on the Pope, to tend, rule, and govern the universal Church." It follows from it that "the Church must form an independent society."

Thus to the lay state founded on religious liberty and the supremacy of the civil power, the Encyclical opposes the ideal of the Catholic state founded on the complete independence of the ecclesiastical power and compulsory unity of faith.

The *Syllabus*, (catalogue) "of the principal errors of our times, set forth in consistorial addresses, encyclicals, and other apostolical letters of Pope Pius IX.," reproduced in a summary form all the doctrines condemned by him. They are numbered, from 1 to 80, and grouped in logical order, beginning with errors of theory under the following titles: I. *Pantheism, naturalism, and absolute rationalism*. II. *Moderate rationalism*. These are philosophic opinions. III. *Indifferentism, latitudinarianism*. This is the theory of liberty of conscience (see p. 693). IV. *Socialism, communism, Bible societies, Clerico-Liberals*. V. *Errors concerning the Church and its rights*. These are the theory of clerical subordination to the lay power,† and the practice of toleration. VI.

*The end of the Encyclical recommends the bishops to teach laymen that "royal power is not conferred simply for the government of the world, but especially for the protection of the Church," and orders prayers for God's aid "in so great calamities of the Church and civil society, in such a conspiracy of enemies, and in so great a mass of errors against Catholic society and the Holy See."

† "19. The Church is not a true and completely free society, it does not enjoy its proper and constant rights, conferred by its divine founder, but it belongs to the civil power to define the rights of the Church and the extent of those rights. 20. Ecclesiastical power may not exercise its authority without the permission of the civil government. 24. The Church has not the right to employ force; it has no temporal power, either direct

Errors concerning civil society considered either by itself or in its relations with the Church. These are the theory of the state's right to interfere in ecclesiastical affairs (*exequatur, recursus ab abusu*, seminaries, religious vows, congregations)* and the theory of lay education.† VII. *Errors concerning natural and Christian morality.* These are the theory of lay morality, the value of the accomplished fact, the principle of non-intervention. VIII. *Errors concerning Christian marriage.* These are civil marriage‡ and divorce. IX. *Errors concerning the temporal power of the Pope.* These relate to the destruction of the temporal power. X. *Errors which relate to modern liberalism.*

The Syllabus thus condemns not only the enemies of the Church who wish to destroy it, but also the indifferent people who wish to take away its official privileges by reducing it to the condition of a private association, and the supporters of religious liberty and neutrality between sects, who demand lay citizenship, lay marriage, and lay schools. It also condemns the

or indirect. 26. The Church has no native and legitimate right to acquire and possess. 30. The immunity of the Church and of ecclesiastical persons arises from civil law. 31. Ecclesiastical justice for the trial of civil or criminal cases against the clergy must be absolutely abolished, even without consulting the Holy See. 32. The personal immunity which exempts the clergy from military service may be repealed without violation of natural rights and equity."

* "42. In case of conflict of laws between the two powers, civil law prevails. 49. Civil authority may prevent communication of the bishops with the Pope or with each other. 50. Lay authority has in itself the right to present bishops and may require them to assume the administration of dioceses without receiving canonical institution from the Holy See. 52. The government may change the age prescribed by the Church for religious profession . . . and order religious communities to allow no person to pronounce their solemn vows without its permission. 53. The civil government may grant its aid to all who wish to give up the religious life and break their vows. 55. Church and state must be separate from each other."

† "47. The best form of civil society demands that the public schools, open to all children, and in general public institutions . . . for higher education . . . shall be free from all Church authority . . . and subject to the direction of civil and political authority."

‡ "66. The marriage sacrament is only an accessory to the contract, and may be separated from it. 67. By natural law the marriage tie is not indissoluble, and in various cases divorce properly so called may be sanctioned by civil authority. 68. The Church has not the power of preventing improper marriages; this power belongs to the civil authority. 74. The trial of cases relating to marriage and betrothal belongs, properly, to civil justice."

conditional allies of the Church who struggled with her against the revolution, and the monarchical governments, advocates of lay sovereignty who have abolished Church courts and obligatory vows, and keep the clergy in subjection by means of *exequatur*, *recursus ab abusu*, and the requirement of previous authorization. To these may be added the Gallicans, the opponents of temporal power, and even the Liberal Catholics, who admit religious liberty.* In order to mark more distinctly the opposition between the ideal Catholic society and modern society, the close of the Syllabus condemns this proposition: "The Pope can be and ought to be reconciled and keep pace with progress, liberalism, and modern civilization."

The Syllabus, owing to its abbreviated and negative form, is difficult of interpretation; it is not enough to turn each of the propositions as formulated into the opposite sense to find the true meaning of the author. There is the further fact that it is a theological document, in which distinction must be made between *thesis* and *hypothesis*; a proposition condemned in principle may be tolerated in practice under given conditions. Two opposite interpretations † of it were published, both approved by the Pope. Compared with the Encyclical, the Syllabus at least shows that the Pope, even if he did not condemn the contemporary lay state, had an altogether different ideal, and preferred the system of the Middle Ages. If the Syllabus was received with joy by the enemies of the Church, who represented it as a declaration of war by the Pope upon modern society, it was received with vexation by the governments, which tried to prevent its publication, and with obvious embarrassment by the Liberal Catholics.

* "77. In our time it is no longer desirable to retain the Catholic religion as the only state religion, to the exclusion of all other beliefs. 78. It is also well that in certain Catholic countries legal provision has been made whereby foreigners going there may enjoy public exercise of their religions."

† In France, Dupanloup, Bishop of Orleans, one of the leaders of the Liberal Catholic party, represented the Syllabus as a reply to the September Convention meant simply to condemn revolution and the abuse of modern liberty ("The Encyclical and the September Convention," 1864). His interpretation won the support of 630 bishops. (See a similar explanation in A. Bosseboeuf, "The Syllabus without Prejudice," 1885.) Schrader, an Austrian Jew, a member of the congregation charged with the drafting of the Syllabus, took the texts, however, in their literal sense as a condemnation of modern society, "Der Papst und die modernen Ideen," 1865.

The Vatican Council (1869-70).—In order to perfect the doctrinal reconstruction of Catholic society, Pius IX. decided to have a solemn recognition of the absolute monarchical power of the Pope in the Church, even in matters of doctrine, under the form of the dogma of Papal infallibility. In 1867 he charged a congregation of six cardinals with the preparation of a project of decrees. Then in June, 1868, he summoned to the Vatican an Ecumenical Council, the first in three centuries.

The Council, which met December 8, 1869, was an exclusively ecclesiastical assembly of about 780 members.* No civil government was represented there. The Pope had made sovereign regulations for the procedure of the council; the plans were drawn up by the committees he had chosen; nothing could come under consideration without his authorization, and the Pope alone possessed the right of initiative. The first discussion was in *general congregation*, under the presidency of a cardinal (chosen by the Pope), who controlled the right of speech. Any proposition which was not adopted unanimously, passed into the hands of a deputation of 24 members elected by secret ballot, who discussed it and presented a printed report. Thence it returned to the general congregation, where each member voted orally: *Placet*, Yes; *Non placet*, No; *Placet juxta modum*, Yes with amendments. The speaking was in Latin; the sessions were secret, and all those who took part in them were bound to secrecy. The public sessions were simply ceremonies of publication. The Pope had at command an assured majority, principally made up of the 224 Italians, the 42 Orientals, and the 119 bishops *in partibus*.

Opposition had begun before the meeting of the Council, in certain publications; † in the Council it was first shown in the protest of Strossmayer, a Croatian bishop, in December, 1869, against the regulation imposed on the assembly by the Pope;

* In the order of ranks: 48 cardinals, 10 patriarchs, 4 primates, 137 archbishops, 527 bishops, 16 mitred abbots, 35 generals, or vicars-general, of orders. By nations: 224 Italians, 81 Frenchmen, 40 Spaniards, 43 Austrians, 16 Germans, 27 English, 19 Irish, 40 Americans from the United States, 9 Canadians, 30 Latin-Americans, 19 Europeans from the small states, 42 Orientals, 119 bishops *in partibus*, etc.

† In Germany, Döllinger, professor of theology at Munich, the most celebrated Catholic theologian in Germany, published a number of articles in the *Augsburg Gazette* in March, 1869, which he gathered into a book under an assumed name: Janus, "The Pope and the Council." In France, Mgr. Maret, professor in the Theological Faculty of Paris published "The Council and Religious Interests," in September, 1869.

then in a petition of the German and Austrian bishops of the same character, in January, 1870. The opposition was of two sorts. The first, the *Anti-infallibilists*, rejected the dogma of infallibility as in itself contrary to the traditions of the Church; Döllinger described it as an "ecclesiastical revolution." The others, the majority it seems, admitted the dogma, but thought the moment inopportune for promulgating it. They feared to irritate the governments and increase the prejudice against the Church produced by the Syllabus by giving the impression that the Pope was aspiring to universal domination. These were known as the *Inopportunist*s; they belonged to the Liberal Catholic party.

The opposition complained of the rules imposed on the Council; of the attitude of the presiding cardinals, who, they said, kept the opposition orators from speaking freely; of the acoustic defects of the place of meeting (a part of a church); of the lack of stenographic reports of the sessions; of articles sent out by journalists of the Infallibilist party (the French bishops drew up against Veuillot, the *Postulata a pluribus Galliarum episcopis*; the Pope sent to Veuillot a commendatory note). They reproached their opponents with hurrying the voting, and estimated that the bishops of the minority represented in themselves a greater number of Catholics than the majority, which was composed chiefly of Italians (24,000,000 souls), of Orientals (1,000,000), and bishops without dioceses. The Pope complained that the secrecy of the deliberations had been violated; that the "Letters from the Council," in the *Augsburg Gazette* in January, 1870, revealed to the public discussions which should have remained secret. He was offended that they had presumed to oppose tradition to him. "I myself am tradition," he said. The public regarded the struggle as a conflict between the Pope, directed by the absolutist Jesuits, and the liberal or national bishops. Even to-day it is hardly possible to establish historically what place this rivalry held in the divisions of the Council.

The Council had to deliberate on various subjects, divided among 4 *deputations*, committees on faith, discipline, religious orders, and Oriental rites. The main point was the definition of the articles of faith. A complete scheme had been drawn up in condemnation of errors, conformably to the Syllabus, but the dogma of infallibility was not included in the scheme. Those who advocated the promulgation of infallibility addressed a petition to the Pope signed by 400 members, begging him to

present the project of promulgation. This was the ground of the conflict. The majority, supported by the Pope, pressed the proposal to a vote; the minority, 46 Germans and Austrians, 30 French, and 20 Italians, first presented an address begging the Pope "not to impose the necessity of that vote" (January, 1870). The Pope promulgated a new regulation, according to which decrees were no longer to require unanimity for their adoption, but only a majority (February 20). The minority replied with a "representation" in March. The Pope then had a new article inserted in the project "on the Church of Christ"—the formal declaration of infallibility. The majority demanded that this article should be discussed before any other.

After unanimously voting a part of the project "on the faith," the Council passed on to the dogma of infallibility, in spite of an address from 77 members protesting against the change in the order of deliberations (April 24). The reporter (chairman of committee) Mgr. Pie of Poitiers, advocated the promulgation; he introduced a new argument: St. Peter was crucified head downward, his head bearing the weight of the whole body, just as the Pope bears the whole Church. Now, it is he who bears that is infallible, not that which is borne. One hundred and thirty-nine amendments to the project were presented; but life in Rome was becoming more and more unhealthy and unpleasant; the majority, urged to bring matters to a conclusion, did not wait for the end of the speeches announced, but voted to close debate. There still remained 40 who wished to speak. The chapter "concerning the Pope," containing the article on infallibility, was voted in general session by 371 *placet* against 88 *non placet* and 61 *placet juxta modum* (July 13). The minority, of 115 members, left Rome before the public session in which the *Constitutio de Ecclesia* was adopted by 547 votes against 2 (July 18). France had just declared war against Prussia; Rome was to be evacuated by the French garrison and thus left without defence against the Italians. The Pope suspended the Council; then, on October 20, adjourned it indefinitely.

The Vatican Council came to an end before finishing the work for which it had been convoked; it had voted only the chapters "on the faith" and 4 chapters "on the Pope." Its part was reduced to the consecration of the dogma of infallibility, which recognised in the Pope the exclusive authority in matters of faith.* This measure did not produce the disasters expected by

* The *Pastor Aeternus* bull of July 18 defined it thus: "The Pope, when he speaks from the throne, *ex cathedra*, that is when, in exercising

those who opposed the promulgation. All the bishops submitted to it. There now remained only the German priests and theologians. These refused to sign the declaration required by their bishops, and established a new Church (1871); but the schism of the *Old Catholics* remained confined to Germany and Switzerland, and even there it was confined to a small minority of theologians and people of the middle class. It did not penetrate into the mass of the faithful. The governments expressed disapprobation; but they thought that the moment had passed for laymen to interfere in matters of faith. Austria alone forbade the publication of the decrees of the Council; a number of German states refused them the *placet*.

Conflicts between Church and State.—After the reaction was over conflict had begun once more between the Catholic Church and the lay governments. The most violent was the Italian conflict on the subject of temporal power and the possession of Rome. The Pope declared the temporal power an indispensable condition for the exercise of his spiritual authority, and the political struggle became one of religion. The Catholics in all the countries demanded the intervention of their governments to secure the *re-establishment of the temporal power*. The Pope, refusing to recognise the Kingdom of Italy, continued in his addresses to protest against the robbery of the "Piedmontese government"; he forbade Catholics to take part in the elections. The Italian government had adopted, since Cavour's time, the motto of the Catholic Liberals—*A free Church in a free state*. It tried to introduce the Belgian system in Italy. On the one hand, it suppressed all that remained of the old compulsory Church authority, Church courts, tithes (1866), and established full religious liberty; later it adopted civil marriage; it suppressed the majority of the convents, and secularized the Church estates, replacing them with salaries for the secular clergy. On the other hand, it abolished the former subjection of the Church to the state, leaving the Pope free to appoint bishops, and reserved to the clergy their honorary privileges. But as the Pope

the office of pastor and teacher of all Christians, by virtue of his apostolic authority, he defines a doctrine on faith or morals which must be adhered to by the whole Church, possesses, by virtue of the divine aid promised him in the person of St. Peter, that *infallibility* with which the Divine Saviour wished to invest his Church in the definition of doctrine on faith and morals; consequently the Pope's definitions under these conditions are in themselves incapable of amendment, even by the consent of the Church."

refused to negotiate, this organization, though established in fact, remained unrecognised by the Church.

The occupation of Rome in September, 1870, greatly aggravated the conflict. The government, by the *law of guarantees*, promised to let the Pope enjoy the personal situation of a sovereign in his palace of the Vatican, to grant him an annual compensation for his lost revenues, and to guarantee him absolute independence in his office as head of the Church. It abolished all power of the civil authority in Church affairs. But Pius IX., declaring himself morally a *prisoner*, refused to negotiate, and shut himself up in the Vatican; he could not go into the city of Rome, where he was exposed, he said, to a meeting with enemies of religion, revolutionists or Protestants, in the free display of their opinions. The conflict became a chronic one and has not yet ceased.

In Austria, the Constitution of 1867, which guaranteed religious liberty contrary to the Concordat, opened the conflict with the Pope. The government began to pass laws contrary to the Concordat; the Pope declared them *null*, by virtue of his apostolic authority, thus affirming the superiority of Church authority, and its right to annul the acts of the lay power. The Austrian government maintained its laws, affirming the right of the lay power to modify by its own sole authority even a regulation made in common with the Church authority. It then used the promulgation of infallibility to rid itself of the Concordat, which it had already violated. It declared that the doctrine set forth by the Council established relations between Church and State on an altogether new footing, by enlarging the Pope's province and concentrating all the powers in his person; one of the two contracting parties having changed its situation, the contract became void. The conflict continued in the laws of 1873, and Austria returned to the system of Joseph II., but without restoring the old forms of state guardianship. The Church found itself in much the same position there as in France, except that it retained its control of marriage and records of population.

In France, up to the end of the Empire, the conflict was confined to minor questions—the publication of the Syllabus in 1864, the struggle of the bishops (Dupanloup) against the Duruy reforms in the University, against the creation of lay schools for girls, and against the materialistic doctrines of the professors. The chief effort of the Catholic party bore on the Roman question, to induce the government to defend the temporal power.

This was a period of sharp controversy between the Liberal Catholics (Dupanloup) and the Infallibilist party (Veuillot and the *Univers*). The conflict ceased during the war. While the National Assembly was in session the Catholic party tried to bring about intervention in favour of the temporal power; it succeeded only in securing the creation of Catholic universities. Then came the "anti-clerical" reaction, which led the Republican party to expel the unauthorized religious orders (1880), and deprived the clergy of the control of the primary public schools, which, since the law of 1850, had been under the municipal councils. This left to the clergy only the private schools. In 1889 the clergy lost even the exemption from military service which they preserved in all the other Catholic states.

In Spain the conflict was violent after the revolution of 1868; for the first time in Spain unity of faith was officially abolished; the Constitution of 1869 proclaimed the public liberty of non-Catholic beliefs; then, the clergy having opposed the government, the Cortes established civil marriage. Pius IX. openly sided with Don Carlos, the legitimate King, and the breach was complete between the Holy See and the Spanish government until the restoration of 1874. The Pope consented to recognise the government of Alphonso XII.; but he did not secure the complete restoration of unity of faith, and protested against the Constitution of 1876, which granted toleration of private worship for non-Catholics.

The Russian government had broken official relations with the Pope in 1866, in connection with the measures for Russification directed against the Catholic Church of Poland; it had withdrawn its ambassador from Rome and forbidden the Polish clergy to hold any communication with the Pope.

In Germany and Switzerland the conflict was indirectly a result of the Council. It began over the excommunication of the *Old Catholics*. It led to a complete rupture with the Holy See.

Pius IX. spent his last years in protesting against the violation of Church liberty in the various states of Europe. He showed his indignation in addresses to pilgrims, circulars to the nuncios, or brief addresses to the clergy and faithful of the countries in conflict.*

* Address to the German Reading Club, June, 1872, against the "persecution of the Church in Germany" directed by "the prime minister"; Pius IX. pronounced the famous words: "Who knows how soon the little stone shall come from the height and break the heel of this colossus?"—

He died leaving the Church engaged in a general conflict with the civil power. Everywhere the Church's official authority had declined. It had lost its exclusive control in the central states; even Spain had escaped from unity of the faith. Italy and Austria had adopted the system of religious liberty. Germany had taken from the Church the control of marriage and clerical autonomy. In France and Belgium a party was to come into power which was hostile to the Church and was preparing to take away the schools from its control. All these struggles, however, had, by exciting the ardour of the Catholics, obliged them to unite and get rid of national and liberal dissensions. All the Catholics joined in a disciplined party, armed for the political fight. The Catholic party was strong enough to keep the power in Belgium from 1870 to 1878; in Switzerland it had been reorganized and had reconquered the old cantons of the *Sonderbund*; in Prussia and Germany it had just created the *centre*; in Austria it was beginning to form a home rule party. In Spain and France it remained a part of the Conservative party, and its principal power. The economic resources of the party had just been shown on the occasion of the thirtieth anniversary of the accession of Pius IX., in 1877; the gifts sent to the Pope by the Catholics exceeded \$3,000,000. The *Peter's Pence*, consisting of voluntary contributions from the faithful, permitted the Holy See to cover its expenses without accepting the grant from Italy.

Policy of Leo XIII.—The successor of Pius IX., Pecci, was elected, it is said, as the candidate of the party intermediate between the supporters and the opponents of reconciliation with Italy (February, 1878). He had been the pupil of Jesuits and the *protégé* of Leo XII.; he took the name of Leo XIII. He had had some experience in politics, having been *delegate* or prefect in the States of the Church, and later papal nuncio in Belgium,

Consistory of Cardinals, December, 1872; address against the attack on the Church lands in Italy, against Germany, the Swiss Confederation, and Spain.—Encyclical, November, 1873, against the persecution in Germany and Switzerland and the protection given to the *Old Catholics*.—Encyclical to the Prussian prelates, February, 1875; which declared the May Laws null and void, as contrary to the divine institution of the Church.—Address to the German pilgrims, May, 1877: "Many centuries ago God sent Attila to rouse the peoples; to-day he has aroused the noble German people by a new Attila."—Address to the Austrian pilgrims: "To-day revolution controls the world against the will of the nations."—Protest against the accession of Humbert under the title of King of Italy, January, 1878.

from 1843 to 1846, the time when the Belgian Catholic party completed its organization.

The political doctrine of Leo XIII. on the relations between Church and state was exactly that of Pius IX.; he expressed in his doctrinal utterances the same ideal of Christian society and reproduced the condemnations of the *Syllabus* against modern society. The Encyclical *Inscrutabili* of 1878 condemned "the laws destructive of the divine constitution of the Catholic Church, adopted in most countries, . . . untrammelled freedom to teach and publish all sorts of evil." *

The Encyclical of December, 1878, concerning "modern errors," directed against socialists, condemns the lay state, sovereignty of the people,† and lay schools.‡

The Encyclical "concerning Christian marriage" (1880) claims the "legislative and judicial control" of marriage, which the Church has not ceased to exercise since the time of the Christian Emperors, and rejects "the distinction made by regalists, who separate the marriage contract from the sacrament . . . so as to subject the contract to the power and whim of the prince."

The Encyclical "concerning the origin of civil power" (1881) condemns the theory of society founded on free consent, "the false philosophy" of the eighteenth century, "what is known

* "The evils which overwhelm humanity from every side" come "from scorning and rejecting the authority of the Church." The Pope denounces "that extensive subversion of the supreme truths which are the foundations of human society." Comparing "the epoch in which we live, so hostile to religion and the Church of Christ, with those happy times when the Church was worshipped as a mother by all nations," he concludes that the cause of the superiority of the old times, "so much more prosperous," lay in the fact that "the peoples were more obedient to the government and laws of the Church," while our epoch "is rushing headlong to ruin." He declares lay civilization a "false civilization." He condemns the civil marriage established by "impious laws," and denounces "the citizens who in place of marriage have adopted legal concubinage."

† "This new impiety, unknown even to the heathen," by which "the states have been constituted without taking account of God and the order He has established," which has announced "that public authority derives its principle, its majesty, and its power to command, not from God, but from the multitude of the people."

"To refuse to recognise God as the source of the right to command is to wish to rob political power of its splendour and cut its sinews. To say that it depends on the will of the people is first of all to commit an error, and secondly, to establish sovereignty on a frail foundation."

‡ "The Creator and Redeemer of mankind shut out of the studies of the universities, colleges, and high schools."

as modern law and the sovereignty of the people" (*imperium popolare*).

The Encyclical "concerning the Free Masons" (1884) denounces them as supporters of the lay state, who "shut out the very wholesome influence of the Catholic religion from the laws and government" and end by "building up a state wholly independent of the institutions and precepts of the Church." It renews the condemnations of the Masons decreed by Pius IX.

The Encyclical *Immortale Dei* (1885) "concerning the Christian constitution of states" condemns "the expectation of seeking the regulation of civil life elsewhere than in the doctrines approved by the Church," enumerates the errors of the "new ideas of law,"* and formally recalls the condemnations of the *Syllabus*.

The Encyclical to the Hungarian bishops (1886) condemns the "schools termed *neutral, mixed, or lay*," created "that the scholars may grow up in complete ignorance of holy things."

The Encyclical "concerning human liberty" (1888) denounces "that extensive and powerful school of men who wish to be called *liberals*," the "supporters of liberalism," who apply the principles of *naturalism* in politics; it condemns modern liberties, *liberty of creed*, liberty of opinion, of the press, of education,†

* The ideas condemned are the natural equality and liberty of all men, sovereignty of the people, unfettered freedom of opinion, and the lay state ("The state makes no public profession of religion; it must not search for the only true creed, nor prefer one to another . . . but must grant to all equality before the law. . . Every religious question must be left to the judgment of individuals; each man shall be free to pursue the religion which pleases him, or even none, if none please him"). The Encyclical asserts that "the Church no less than the state is a perfect society by nature and by right," and that "the governors . . . must not deprive it of any rights conferred by Jesus Christ."

† They are thus formulated: "It is lawful for each man to profess the religion he prefers, or even none." . . (The Pope explains that this liberty offered to man confers on him the power to distort or even desert, with impunity, the most sacred of duties.)—"The state has no reason to express any form of belief in God . . . nor to prefer one belief to another, but must recognise the same rights in all." (The Pope explains that "justice and right forbid the state to become atheistic, or, which would lead to atheism, to have the same feeling toward various religions and to grant them equal rights without distinction.")—In speech and press the Pope recognises only the right "to spread freely and prudently all that is true and honest"; but as for "false opinions," it is just that public authority should repress them, that they may not be allowed to extend to the ruin of the state.

"which are vaunted as triumphs of our times." In opposition to *liberalism* the Pope explains the nature of the *toleration* granted by the Church, which must be precarious.*

The Encyclical "of the protection of St. Josèph and the Holy Virgin, to implore their aid in the difficulties of the times" (1889), declares the present time "hardly less calamitous for Christian society than those which have always been regarded as the most calamitous."

Leo XIII. maintained toward the Italian government the same attitude as Pius IX. Never did he cease to reclaim temporal power as the indispensable condition of the liberty of the Holy See and the free exercise of spiritual power. Each year, in his solemn addresses to the cardinals, on the anniversary of his coronation, March 5, and on Christmas, he renewed his protest against the occupation of Rome and reserved the rights of the Holy See.† Like Pius IX., he persisted in declaring himself

*"The Church would like to introduce Christian principles at once into practice in all orders of the state. For they are the most powerful agent in overcoming the evils of the present time . . . born in great part of these boasted liberties. . . If a remedy is sought, let it be sought in the return of wholesome doctrines. . . Nevertheless, in her maternal judgment, the Church takes account of human frailty, and does not ignore the tide which invades our epoch. With this motive, while granting *rights* only to true and honest things, she does not oppose the public power in its support of some things contrary to truth and justice in order to avoid a greater evil or to secure or preserve a greater good. . . But . . . the more evil a state has to tolerate, the more that state is cut off from perfection; and the tolerance of evil . . . must be absolutely circumscribed within the limits that public safety demands. . . If, in view of the special conditions of the state, it happens that the Church agrees to certain modern liberties, not that she prefers them in themselves, but because she judges it expedient to allow them; in case the times should improve, she should use her liberty . . . to fulfil the duty God has assigned to her, to labour for the eternal salvation of mankind. It is always true that this liberty for all men in all things is not desirable in itself, because it is contrary to reason that the false should have the same rights as the true." —The Pope condemns not only "the separation of Church and state," but the doctrine "that it is not within the Church's province to make laws, to judge, or to punish, and that she must confine herself to the exhortation, persuasion, and direction of those who voluntarily subject themselves to her."

* He makes besides a special protest against the law which transfers to the Italian government the administration of the possessions of the *Propaganda*, an international congregation, which was to be independent of all lay authority (1884); against the anti-Catholic demonstrations at the transfer of the ashes of Pius IX. (1881); against the monument to Giordano Bruno (1889).

a moral prisoner, and made it a rule never to go out of the Vatican. He never officially recognised the Italian government; he did not notify it of his accession; he refused to negotiate with it, to accept the law of the guarantees, or even the money for his civil list. He forbade Italian Catholics to take part in the elections. Every rumour of a reconciliation between the Pope and the King of Italy, Leo energetically denied. The churchmen who dared to propose conciliation, Curci in 1884 and Tosti in 1887, were disowned and forced to retract. The Catholic princes who visited the King of Italy were not received at the Vatican, Leo accepting only Protestant princes under these conditions. Several times, in 1883, 1884, and 1889, a rumour was spread about that the Pope was going to move his residence out of Italy. The pilgrims continued to regard the Pope as the sovereign of Rome, and sometimes they showed this by crying: "Long live the Pope King!"

Like Pius IX., Leo XIII. waged continual war on the Free Masons; he issued a special encyclical against them, the *Humanum Genus* of 1884, and a letter to the Italian people in 1892, in which he recommended them "to avoid any connection with persons suspected of belonging to the Free Masons or any similar society."

But the practical policy of Leo XIII. was not that of Pius IX. Instead of struggling against the governments, he made terms with them, except in Italy, where he would have been obliged to sacrifice the principle of the temporal power. Instead of prolonging the conflict, he tried to end it. He succeeded in renewing the relations which Pius had broken off with Switzerland, the German Empire, and Russia. In France, during the struggle of 1880 against the congregations, he avoided a rupture and against the congregation of 1880, he avoided a rupture and confined himself to approval of the protests made by the French bishops. Instead of leaving the Catholics in each country to fight alone, he tried to take the direction of the Catholic parties and press, so as to combine their action.

His policy seems to have been to form in each country a Catholic party which should represent a sufficiently great power politically to make its alliance desirable, and to offer this alliance to the government in return for concessions to the Church. In Germany Leo got the Centre to vote for the military law, and after long negotiation, gradually secured the abolition of the measures adopted during the *Culturkampf*, except civil marriage and the modifications of the Prussian Constitution. In

England he assisted the government against the Irish agitation by sending to Ireland, in 1888, a nuncio who decided against the Land League. In Russia he exhorted the Polish clergy to obedience in 1894, and in 1895 secured the reappointment of a Russian ambassador to the Papal Court. In France, after the defeat of the Conservatives in 1889, he tried to establish a Catholic party (1891-92) by ordering the Catholics to accept the Republican constitution in order to labour for the repeal of laws contradictory to the rights of the Church.

The Pope was thus led to interfere in the domestic policy of the governments. At first he met resistance from the leaders of the Catholic parties, who were accustomed to direct the policy of their party—the Irish in 1883 and 1887, the German Centre in 1887, and the French Conservatives in 1891. They pretended to distinguish between matters of faith, in which every Catholic is bound to obey the Pope, and temporal questions, in which every man is independent. Leo XIII. condemned this distinction as contrary to the legitimate authority of the Holy See, holding that the Pope, as head of the Church, is the only judge of the interests of the Church and that the faithful have no right to fix the limits of their obedience.* The monarchical unity of religious control, proclaimed at the Vatican Council, pointed to unity in the political direction of all Catholics.

After the attempts at socialistic policy by the German government, Leo also interfered in the social movement with the famous Encyclical "concerning the condition of the working classes" (1891); he condemned socialism and strikes, preached harmony between capital (*res*) and labour (*opera*), praised industrial corporations, and recommended the creation of unions of Catholic workmen.

Leo XIII. has endeavoured to bring the Orthodox churches into Catholic unity. In 1884, at the solemn reception of the Slavic Catholic pilgrims, Croats, Czechs, and Galicians, led by the head of the Croat nationalists, Bishop Strossmayer, he expressed the hope of the union of the great Slav nation. In 1894 he pub-

* In France the Pope signified his decision by repeated acts, in 1892. Letter to the Archbishop of Paris, January 5; Encyclic to bishops and faithful, February 16; Encyclic to French cardinals, May 6; Letter to French Catholics, June 14; Letter to the Bishop of Grenoble, June 22: "When politics are allied to religious interests, it becomes the part of the head of the Church to determine the best means to defend the religious interests."

lished the Encyclical "to the princes and peoples of the world," inviting into the union the Orientals and even the Protestants. He convoked a conference to prepare the way for union, and promulgated a regulation for the Eastern churches which came over to Rome, guaranteeing them the maintenance of their religious rites.

In the course of the nineteenth century, the state has taken from the Catholic Church in Europe all material power; it has suppressed compulsory unity of faith to establish religious liberty. But through the *effective* concentration of all Church authority in the person of the Pope, now an absolute sovereign, through the creation in all the countries of parliamentary Catholic parties, all subject to a common centre, through the enlargement of the clerical body, both secular and regular, through the accumulation of wealth, and the organization of Catholic schools of all degrees, the Church has acquired a social and political power which is certainly superior to the official power she has lost.

BIBLIOGRAPHY.

BIBLIOGRAPHY.—**Funk**, "Hist. de l'Église," French trans., 2d ed., 2 vols., 1895, Catholic.—**Kurtz**, "Lehrbuch der Kirchengesch.," 2 vols., 9th edit., 1885, Protestant.

DOCUMENTS.—Collections of the most important official acts, beside the Papal Acts, "Collection of Addresses . . . by the Pontiffs," are: **Walter**, "Fontes Juris Ecclesiastici . . .," 1862, for conventions with the Holy See.—"Acta et Decreta Sac. Conciliorum Recentiorum," 7 vols., 1870-90 (vol. vii. on Vatican Council).—The Encyclical of 1864 and the Syllabus are published separately: **Raulx**, "Encycl. et Docum.," etc., 2 vols., 1865. The great Encyclicals of the Popes, as well as the *Syllabus*, in a popular Catholic collection (with a Fr. trans.), "Apostolic Letters of Pius IX., Gregory XVI., Pius VII." (s. d. 1893), and "Apostol. Letters of His Holiness Leo XIII.," 4 vols. (s. d.)

The speeches of Pius IX. and Leo XIII. have been gathered together in Italian collections, the "Discorsi."

For the Council: **Friedberg**, "Sammlung der Aktenstücke zum Vatikan. Concil.," 1872, Old Cath.—**Fronz**, "Actes et Hist. du Concile," 8 vols., infol.—**Friedrich**, "Documenta ad Illustrandum Concil. Vatican.," 1871.—**Veuillot**, "Rome Pendant le Concile," 2 vols., 1872.

The chief Catholic periodicals are: *Civiltà Catholica*, since 1850; *L'Univers*, previous to 1848; *Stimmen aus Maria Laach* (German Jesuits), since 1865; *Études Religieuses*, since 1856 (Jesuits); *Le Correspondant*, since 1829 (Cath. Liberal).

WORKS.—The general Church histories: **Funk** (Cath.); **Kurtz** (Prot.)

re rather summary.—**Rohrbacher**, "Hist. de l'Église," 1842-49, continued by **Chantrel** and **Chamard**, "Annales Ecclesiastiques" is an uncritical compilation.

MODERN CHURCH HISTORIES: **Gams**, "Gesch. der Kirche Christi," 3 vols., 1854, Cath.—**Nielsen**, "Gesch. des Papstthums im XIX. Jahrhundert," 2 vols., 1880 (Danish).

SPECIAL HISTORIES: For Germany, **Nippold**, "Handb. der Neuesten Kirchengesch.," 3d ed., 4 vols., 1883-92; **Brück**, "Gesch. der Kathol. Kirche im XIX. Jahrh.," vols. i.-iii., 1887-96, goes to 1870.

BIOGRAPHIES OF THE POPES (see **Kurtz** and **Funk**): The chief of these are: **Artaud**, "Hist. de Pie VII.," 2 vols., 1837, "de Léon XII.," 1843, "de Pie VIII.," 1844.—**Pougeois**, "Hist. de Pie IX.," 6 vols., 1877-86, prolix.—**Reilly**, "Life of Leo XIII.," 1877.

VATICAN COUNCIL: **Cecconi**, "Storia del Concilio," 1873 (Fr. trans., "H. du Concile," 4 vols., 1887), Roman.—**Friedrich**, "Gesch. des Vatikanischen Concils," 2 vols., 1877-83, Cath. opposition.—**Friedberg**, "Samml. der Aktenstücke," already mentioned, gives a condensed history, opposition.—**Arthur**, "The Pope, the Kings . . .," 2 vols., 1877, Prot.

OLD CATHOLICS: **Schulte**, "Der Altkatholicismus . . .," 1887.

LIBERAL CATHOLICS: **A. Leroy-Beaulieu**, "Les Catholiques Libéraux . . . de 1830 à nos jours," 1885, interesting sketch.—**Minghetti**, "L'État et l'Église," trans. from the Italian, 1882, doctrine of the Italian liberal Catholics.

ECCLESIASTICAL LAW: **Liberatore**, "La Chiesa e lo Stato," 1871 (Fr. trans.); "Le Droit Public de l'Église," 1888.—**Tarquini**, "Juris. Eccles. Publ. Institutiones; Principes du Droit Public de l'Église," 1891; both expound the pontifical doctrine.—**Hergenrother**, "Lehrb. des Kathol. Kirchenrechts," 1888, Cath.—**Philipps**, "Kirchenrecht," 8 vols., 3d edit., 1872-89, Cath.—**Richter**, "Lehrb. des Kathol. u. Evangel. Kirchenrechts," 3th ed., 1886, Prot., expounds German law in particular.

CHAPTER XXIV.

THE INTERNATIONAL REVOLUTIONARY PARTIES.

Free Masons and Carbonari.—Free Masonry, which had in the eighteenth century become a society for the propagation of humanitarian doctrines, was a kind of international federation, without the character of a political party. But in endeavouring to establish religious liberty, it brought itself into conflict with the Church, which condemned it as a heresy in 1738 and 1751. In so far as it was preparing for the destruction of the coercive power of the churches, it became a revolutionary association.

After the French Revolution, when the system of the lay state was established, it became once more a peaceful society, without precise political aim. After the Restoration, in the countries which preserved religious liberty, it remained a secret society in name, with secret rites and mysterious meetings, but tolerated in fact, in some cases even encouraged. It drew its members from among the well-to-do middle classes, and even from among the high officials, often choosing members of the government as its dignitaries. In the central countries, where Catholicism was again obligatory, the Free Masons were a really secret society, prohibited, pursued, and consequently revolutionary, recruited principally among the free-thinking young men of the bourgeoisie and discontented army officers. In Spain, Portugal, and Italy, and especially in the States of the Church, the Free Masons conspired against the government.

The Free Masons of different countries had but one principle in common, namely, religious liberty. They supported every form of government, and did not call themselves republican. In actual fact they were chiefly from the liberal parties, hostile to the clergy and to absolute government. The society was organized in self-governing lodges united as a federation, ordinarily as a national federation—each nation having a Grand Master and a Supreme Council.

The Free Masons kept themselves in communication from one country to another, and had international signs of recogni-

tion. It is probable that those of the constitutional countries worked against the governments that persecuted their fellows; it is also possible that the Masons had transmitted from one country to another a certain idea, somewhat vague, of a liberal constitutional system. Was there, beside the national official organization, a secret international directory, working, in addition to the acknowledged doctrines and aims, to make a republican, lay revolution in all the countries? This is the view of certain Catholic writers, Crétineau-Joly, Father Deschamps, Claudio Jannet. It is not possible to settle it historically; we can only see that there was no unity of political doctrine among Free Masons, that a number of revolutionary leaders have been Free Masons, that some have gone into the Masonic lodges to win supporters, perhaps even to propagate revolutionary ideas there. But there is nothing to show that they worked for revolution as *Free Masons*.

The Restoration governments differed in their conduct toward the Free Masons. The Protestant states left them alone. In France the Liberal ministries (Descazes) favoured them. The Tsar of Russia, Alexander I., encouraged the creation of lodges. Metternich, on the contrary, forbade all associations and denounced to the other governments the intrigues of the *sects*, as he termed all political or religious societies, including the mysticists and Bible societies. He took advantage of the associations of German students (which were probably purely national and without connection with Free Masonry), and more emphatically of the revolution in Spain and Italy, to ask the Tsar to suppress secret societies (1820-21). Alexander decided, in 1822, to forbid Free Masonry in Russia.

After the absolutist restoration in Naples, the secret society of *Carbonari*, hitherto exclusively Italian, entered into relations with the French revolutionists, perhaps with the Free Masons. The French *Charbonnerie* was then constituted on the Italian model, in 1821, by the founders of a Masonic lodge, the *Friends of Truth*, Buchez, Joubert, Bazard, and Flottard. This was, however, a national society, with a national platform, the expulsion of the Bourbons (see p. 122). The only international organization was the *Cosmopolitan Alliance*, founded by certain leaders of the French Liberals, among them Lafayette.

The action of the secret societies was confined to unsuccessful revolutions in Spain and Italy, and unsuccessful conspiracies against the Bourbons, from 1820 to 1822; and perhaps to the

revolt of the Russian *Decabrists* (see p. 558), but they helped to form in France the little Republican party which made the revolution of 1830, and in Belgium the Liberal party, which was organized by Defacqz, Grand Master of the Free Masons (see p. 246).

The Republican "Young Europe."—In imitation of the French Republican party, Republican parties were formed in several countries after 1830. They were recruited among the young men and workingmen, and were particularly active in the feebly governed states, Germany, central Italy, and Poland. These parties were in communication from one country to another, but were without international management; their action in each country was limited to demonstrations in favour of the revolutionists of the other countries; they demanded first of all intervention to aid the Poles in their rebellion against the Tsar, and the subjects of the Pope in their attempt at revolution.

After the failure of the revolts Mazzini endeavoured to establish a political association to make methodical preparation for revolution and set up a democratic, lay republic. The organization, primarily Italian with a foreign centre, became very quickly European (see p. 335). *Young Italy* became a branch of *Young Europe*. It was founded to unite all Italy in a single state, "a republic one and indivisible"; the members promised to obey and keep the secret; a secret tribunal condemned traitors and chose some of their members to kill them.

Mazzini succeeded in organizing several national sections, Young Italy, Young Poland, Young Germany, Young Switzerland, Young France, and Young Spain. These were composed of men over forty years of age, chiefly belonging to the bourgeoisie. They were all federated, under Mazzini's direction. This man's extraordinary activity accomplished only conspiracies, unsuccessful outbreaks, and some assassinations. After 1848 Young Europe broke up, without having gained any direct political result. But the republican groups in France, Germany, Switzerland, and Poland served as revolutionary centres from which communist and socialist parties have sprung.

Mazzini continued to plot to make Italy a republic and expel the Austrians. He incited the Orsini attempt against Napoleon III., for having failed to keep his oath to deliver Italy. During the period in which the unity of Italy was getting accomplished (1859-70), he was in communication with the heads of the Italian government, perhaps with King Victor Emmanuel, with the

Hungarian refugees, Kossuth, Generals Türr and Klapka, and with the Polish insurgents. Attempts were made to organize a general insurrection against Austria. This was not, however, an international party; it was only a coalition of national revolutionists.

The Socialistic Schools.—While the republican parties were beginning to prepare a political revolution, parties of a new character were formed, who laboured after a social revolution.

The movement began under the Restoration, 1814-30, simultaneously in England and France, by slow and confused work over the adoption of doctrines. Certain peace-loving philanthropists, Owen and Thomson in England, Saint-Simon and Fourier in France, criticised modern society. Taking it up where the eighteenth century philosophers had left it, they did not stop at political institutions, but took up social institutions,—private property, inheritance, the family, and wages—institutions which were regarded as the very foundations of society by the philosophers and economists. The creation of the factory system began to produce a change, already visible in the more advanced countries, England and France. It had formed a new class of wage-earners, having nothing but their daily wages to live on, and reduced during industrial crises to starvation and wretchedness. People began to talk of the *proletarians*, an old Roman name revived to designate a new class, and of *pauperism*, a new sort of distress caused by industrial wealth.

The objections, though very different in form, may be reduced to two fundamental ideas:

1. Society was too hard on the poor, inflicted on them too much suffering, too mean and uncertain wages, an unhealthy occupation, laborious and brutalizing, too long working hours, a servile dependence on the master and his foreman, small, dirty, and unhealthy lodgings, unwholesome food, a sad and disorderly life, and prostitution for the women. The protest against this system took a sentimental form of compassion for the poor, indignation against the rich, mingled with early Christian reminiscences and ranting speeches. It was expressed in France by the formula "To each according to his needs," or in judicial language, *the right to existence*.

2. Society was organized contrary to justice. Property and inheritance divided men into two unequal classes. From this inequality, consecrated by law contrary to the principles of 1789, arose an injustice in dividing the products of labour. The cap-

italist kept the product and gave the labourer only a wage, obviously inferior to his worth, since the employer's wealth increased, although it was not he that had done the work. This demand was expressed in the phrase "To each according to his works," or, in judicial language, *right to the full product of labour*. Combining the two formulæ the next demand was for the *right of labour*—the right of existence through labour.

The authors of this social theory, later called *socialists*, attributed the vices of society to its economic organization, private property, inheritance, wages, and free competition, which they also reproached with the wasting of forces. As to remedies they could not agree. Before 1830, however, two systems had already been set forth: that of Owen and that of Saint-Simon, perfected by Bazard. The official organ of the Saint-Simonians, the *Globe* (1830), took for its motto: "All social institutions must have as their object the bettering of the moral, material, and intellectual conditions of the poorest and most numerous class; all privileges of birth must be abolished without exception. To each according to his capacity, to each capacity according to its works."

A second generation of socialists, P. Leroux Considérant, L. Blanc, and Proudhon in France, Rodbertus and Marlo (pseudonym of Winkelblech) in Germany, completed the social theory.

All the socialists except Louis Blanc were outside of political life, and confined themselves to the propagation of their ideas. Some of them tried to create a model society, to test their reform on a small scale—the St.-Simonians, Owen, the Fourierists, Cabet, and the Icarians; but they did not organize political parties. They were nevertheless the fathers of socialism. It was they who conceived all the criticisms of existing society, all the formulas, even the practical means of action and the measures of socialistic reform. Previous to 1848 there was already talk of "exploitation of man by man," of the "right to labour," of "surplus value," anarchy, social democracy, inter-class struggles, workingman's party, international understanding between workmen, emancipation of the proletariat, organization of labour, industrial federation, and the like. Co-operative association of producers was proposed. National workshops, gratuitous loans, bank of exchange, superannuation fund, laws for the protection of industry, collective ownership, progressive taxation, general strike, eight-hour day, workingmen's congresses, etc., were advocated.

The socialist parties, which were formed later, lived on the intellectual labour of the first half of the century.

The Communist Parties.—The socialist schools did not constitute a revolutionary party. The movement toward social revolution began first in the revolutionary republican party in Paris under the form of a revival of Babeuf's communism; it was a survivor of Babouvism, Buonarotti, who converted Voyer d'Argenson,* and later those who were accused in the April prosecutions (see p. 139). A *communist* party detached itself from the French Republican party, demanding a social revolution by the abolition of private ownership. Its further doctrines remained rudimentary: it was first of all a party for revolutionary action (see p. 150). But the communist propaganda had reached Germany.

In Germany a division similar to that in the French party had taken place in the revolutionary democratic party of 1833 (see p. 382). Büchner founded in Hesse a secret society, the *Rights of Man*, and in 1834 addressed the peasantry in a paper beginning: "Peace to the cottages! War on the palaces." He declared political revolution impossible without a social revolution.

In Paris, the German workmen and refugees founded, in 1836, a secret society, the *Bund der Gerechten* (League of the Just), which quickly took the name of *Alliance of Communists* and organized itself as a federation. It consisted of groups called *communes*, federated in *clubs*, which sent delegates to a *congress*, where a central authority was chosen to direct the whole league. The *Alliance of Communists* was in relations with workingmen's clubs (*Arbeiterbildungsvereine*) for reading, study, and discussion, where it worked to win support.

The Alliance, created in Paris, gathered adherents in the countries of political liberty: in Switzerland, where the tailor Weitling settled himself in 1841 and spread the doctrine among the German workingmen; † in England, where a refugee, Schapper, founded a "commune" at London, in 1840; in Belgium, where Karl Marx and Engels founded a group at Brussels in 1845.

* In 1838 d'Argenson and Ch. Teste were prosecuted for a communistic pamphlet. Teste proposed a social reform thus conceived: "Art. 1. All real and personal estate . . . belongs to the people, who alone may regulate its distribution.—Art. 2. Work is a necessary duty of every citizen."

† Weitling preached a sentimental doctrine—liberty, equality, harmony; he wished a bloodless revolution, attacking only property. "The Gospel of the Poor Fisherman" (1843) was a communistic interpretation of Christ's doctrines.

Germans predominated in all these groups; they were chiefly workmen in the superior metals, and Jews, in relations with the radical German poets, Freiligrath, Herwegh, Gutzkow, and with the democrats who directed the publication named the *Vorwärts*. The French government suppressed the paper and exiled some of its editors—Karl Marx, who went to Brussels, Moses Hess, who went back to Germany. There was at that time in the Rhine region, Cologne, Trèves, and Düsseldorf, a centre of communist propaganda, publishing prohibited writings. There were also communist demonstrations in the manufacturing regions of Silesia, and a secret society was discovered there, which was perhaps without connection with the international movement. The weavers' revolt in 1844, made famous by G. Hauptmann's drama, seems to have been only a bread riot.

To escape the prosecutions that followed the Blanqui-Barbès trial in 1840 the central authorities of the *Alliance* moved from Paris to London, where they remained until 1848. In 1846 they persuaded Karl Marx and Engels, who were then at Brussels, to join the *Alliance*, and asked them to draw up a manifesto, which was accepted by the Congress of 1847. This was the celebrated *Manifesto of the Communist Party*, published early in 1848, before the Revolution. It passed unnoticed at the time, but it has of late years become the gospel of the collectivist party, for it contains already all Marx's doctrines in a concise and vivid form. It was divided into 4 parts: 1. *Capitalists and proletarians*, history of the social evolution; * 2. *Proletarians and communists*, justi-

* The fundamental ideas are: 1. "The history of all society to the present day is simply the history of *struggles between classes*. Society is divided more and more into two hostile classes, Capitalists and Proletarians."—2. "Every class struggle is a political struggle." "Political power is the organized power of one class for the suppression of another." "Modern government is simply a committee for the administration of the affairs of the capitalist class."—"3. The factory system has created the market of the world." "By exploiting the world's market, the capitalist class gives a cosmopolitan character to production in all countries; it has taken from industry its national basis." Society has become international.—4. "The capitalist class . . . has created more varied and more colossal productive forces than all past generations," but "the system has become too narrow to hold the wealth created within it"; hence "the paradoxical epidemic of over-production." The middle class has produced crises more and more general.—5. "The capitalist class has produced . . . men who will deal it its deathblow, the modern workmen, the *proletarians* . . . crowded into the factories, with military organization." They "are increasing in power and are becoming conscious of their power," re-enforced

fication of the doctrines and practical program of the party; * 3. *Socialist and communist literature*, criticism of socialist doctrines, *reactionary socialism*, *bourgeois socialism* (Proudhon), *critico-Utopian socialism and communism* (Owen, Fourier, Cabet); 4. *Position of communists in face of the various opposition parties*, party policy.

The conclusion is international and revolutionary. "The communists labour for the union of democratic parties in all countries. They do not stoop to dissimulate their opinions and aims. They proclaim aloud that their ends could not be attained without the violent overturning of all existing social order." And the manifesto ends with the famous appeal: "Proletarians of all nations, unite."

The Revolutionary Parties during the Revolution of 1848 and the Reaction.—The revolutionary parties, political and social, republican, democratic, socialist, communist, formed in Europe before 1848 only little isolated groups in certain cities, tracked by the police, obliged to work in secret and often to hide or leave the city, ignored or scorned by the public. The French revolution of 1848, made by the action of the socialist democratic party, in the name of equality and the Republic, excited the hopes of all European revolutionists. Refugees returned to their na-

by the lower middle class, the artisans, the peasants who are falling into the proletariat."—6. "Until now all historic movements have been produced by minorities to their own profit. The proletarian movement is the movement of the immense majority for the benefit of the majority." It begins with "a national struggle" in each country. But it will become international, for "workingmen have no country."

* The communists defend "the common interests of the proletariat"; their propositions are not inventions of world reformers, they are confined to the "expression of the actual conditions of an existing class contest, of an historical movement"; their aim is to organize the proletarians in a class party, to have the proletariat gain political power, and to abolish middle-class property ownership, "created by the labour of wage-earners for the profit of capitalists." Capital is "a social power," it will become common property. This will be the abolition of "middle-class freedom" (of commerce), of the "middle-class family," of traditional religion and morality, and of hostility between nations. The revolution will be made by a political process. As transitional measures, the manifesto proposes: 1. the confiscation of land rent; 2. highly progressive direct taxes; 3. abolition of inheritance; 4. confiscation of the property of emigrants; 5. centralization of credit by a national bank with public capital and exclusive monopoly; 6. centralization of all means of transportation; 7. national manufactories, national cultivation of the land; 8. compulsory labour for all; 9. public free education for all children.

tive lands, in Germany and Italy, to join in the revolution. The revolutionists remained in communication, from country to country, some of them even went to other countries to aid the democratic insurgents against the governments. The Poles in particular took part in all the European insurrections, and intervention in favour of Poland was demanded by the revolutionary parties in France and Germany. The Revolution of 1848 was not, however, the work of an international party. The revolutionists of the different nations excited one another by example and encouragement, but they made only national revolts, without common direction.

In France the revolutionists, at the head of the government, divided into democratic republicans, opposing social revolution, and democratic socialists. The discord led to civil war. In the other countries the republicans, forced to struggle once more against monarchical government, remained united (Prussia, Germany, Austria-Hungary, and Italy); the difference in doctrine remained theoretical and did not hinder the communists and socialists from working in harmony with the democratic republicans. But a number of industrial organizations were founded in Germany. A social-democratic union of workingmen in Berlin held a workingmen's congress in August, 1848, out of which grew the *Fraternity*, a German federation of workingmen, who took part in the revolutions of Baden and Dresden. In the west, at Cologne, Karl Marx founded a communist newspaper; a socialist workingmen's union was established, and an assembly voted a bill to establish a "social democratic republic" (September, 1848). After the *coup d'état* at Berlin, the communists issued a proclamation for the refusal of taxes; Marx at Cologne and Lassalle at Düsseldorf were prosecuted for inciting revolt. In the Frankfort Parliament sat a number of socialist deputies, who demanded recognition of the right to labour. In Italy the movement remained democratic and national.

The reaction of 1849 and 1850 destroyed the revolutionary groups; the communists, prosecuted in Germany, France, and even Belgium and Switzerland, fled to London. The *Alliance* was reorganized there in 1849 and tried to renew relations with the communes in Germany, France, and Switzerland, but it was cut into two groups, one of which, under Willich, wished to continue preparations for an armed revolution; the other, under Marx, wished to confine itself to the propagation of the doctrine. The Marx group moved to Cologne and was surprised

by the police, in 1851. The subsequent prosecution of the Cologne communists, who were condemned for high treason, obliged Marx to dissolve his group. The Diet, on the request of the two great powers, passed a decree, in 1854, obliging all the German governments to dissolve all political societies of workingmen. The Willich group retained the management of the societies in Switzerland, Brussels, and France, and even established an "international social-democratic committee"; it was discovered by the French police.

The socialists, reduced to hiding, disappeared completely from public life; the governments, warned by the revolution of 1848, took measures against revolutionary propagandism; the movement seemed to have definitely failed. L. Reybaud, writing the history of the socialists, said: "Socialism is dead; to mention it is to pronounce its funeral oration."

When political life began again after 1859, a doctrine was preached which seemed new to most people of the time, so completely was socialism forgotten. Yet it was simply a revival of the socialist movement of the days previous to 1848; the leaders were the men of '48, Karl Marx, Lassalle, Liebknecht, who taught a new generation the doctrines, formulæ, and procedure of the former socialists.

The revival was brought about simultaneously by two independent and even rival creations, Karl Marx' *International Association* and Lassalle's *German National Party*.

The International (1862-72).—The new socialist organization began in London, the centre of socialist refugees, the residence of Karl Marx. The first step was taken by the leaders of the English workingmen, the general secretaries of the trade unions. The occasion was the London Exhibition of 1862, where the English workingmen met delegates from the French and Belgian working classes. They met again, in 1863, in a great meeting held in London to protest in favour of the Polish insurgents. To this French delegates also were sent. The idea of international association was mentioned.

The Frenchmen were men of a new generation (Tolain, Fribourg), who were not acquainted with the socialists of 1848; their ideal was Proudhon's mutualism, the association of workingmen without state intervention. The English from the trade unions, already accustomed to their national associations of workingmen, dreamed of an international association which, by extending joint responsibility among the workingmen of every nation, would

hinder employers from opposing workmen of one country to those of another.

They complained that, to break down strikes, English employers resorted to foreign labourers. There was no plan as yet for anything more than a professional association without political aim.

A final meeting in London, September 28, 1864, appointed a committee of 50 members to draw up the statutes for an association. The former revolutionists presented schemes: Mazzini one for a strongly centralized organization, Marx one for a federation. Mazzini's plan was rejected, as it did not seem to have been designed for a society of workingmen. Marx' plan was adopted, in the form of provisional statutes, in 1864.

The *International Association of Labourers* was organized as a federation. The members, who declared themselves faithful to the principles of the association, divided into self-governing *sections*, each having its committee. The subscription was very small, almost nominal. The Association had two common organs: the *Congress* of delegates from the sections, meeting once a year and invested with sovereign power, and the *General Council*, appointed by the Congress. The Council was to be stationary in London, and was charged with the preparation of business for the Congress and with conducting the correspondence with the sections. This was the system of the English trade societies, with no resemblance to the former revolutionary secret societies. No professional condition was required; the French delegates' proposal to admit only manual labourers had been rejected. In fact, not only workingmen joined the International, but also revolutionists and even middle-class philanthropists, as, for instance, Jules Simon. The avowed object was to establish a centre of union and of common methodical action between the workingmen's clubs of the different countries which aimed at the protection, progress, and emancipation of the labouring classes. It was to be accomplished now only by peaceful agreement.

The "International" gained members slowly. The first congress could not be held until 1866, at Geneva, where definite statutes were adopted. After this there was an annual congress, held in some small country, usually Switzerland; and Marx took the direction of the General Council, making it the real power. The International at once assumed the character of a political society, becoming more and more revolutionary at each congress.

The Congress of 1866, at Geneva, confined itself to formulating

general principles,* but it was here that Marx's theory of class strife first appeared. He recommended the organization of an understanding between workingmen against the intrigues of capitalists, and an investigation into the condition of the working classes in every country; also the encouragement of co-operative production and workingmen's syndicates. He demanded the abolition of standing armies.

The Congress of 1867, at Lausanne, declared "that the social emancipation of the labouring man is inseparable from political emancipation and that the acquisition of political liberty is a prime necessity." It voted that the state should assume control of transportation.

The Congress of 1868, at Brussels, protested against war and the wages system, pronounced itself in favour of the international organization of strikes, and demanded that mines and quarries, forests and means of communication should be made common property. On the land question it expressed the opinion that "economic evolution will make the taking of arable soil into the collective ownership of the state a social necessity." The International adopted Marx' collectivist doctrine.

The Congress of 1869, at Bâle, confirmed the resolutions of 1868, against the will of the French, who upheld individual property rights. It declared that "society has the right to convert private lands into collective lands, and that this transformation is necessary."

The International returned to the communist program of 1848: to unite the proletarians of every nation and establish collective ownership of implements of labour. But this was only a doctrine. No exact program was formulated as to the practical means of realizing it; and, besides, the International was opposed to the use of force. It was thought to be rich, like the trade unions; the workingmen clung to it to get support in case of strikes, and they had a chance to make reluctant employers yield by means of this imaginary aid. The members did not pay, however, and the treasury remained almost empty.

*"The emancipation of the labouring class must be accomplished by the labouring class itself. . . The economic emancipation of the labouring class is the final end to which every political movement must be subordinated as a means. This emancipation is neither a local nor national, but a social problem, which includes every country where modern society exists, and whose solution depends on the common action of the most advanced countries."

The International greatly alarmed the governments and the employing class. In France the committee of the Paris section was first prosecuted (1867), then all the leaders were arrested (1870). In reality it acted simply as a society for the propagation of doctrine, and its career was a brief one. It was at once attacked from without and disorganized from within.

The war of 1870 weakened it by exciting national patriotism against every international body; the protest of the General Council of the International against a war of German conquest, in September, 1870, passed unnoticed. The war brought on the Commune of Paris; this was not a product of the International, but rather a reminiscence of 1792; even the small minority of internationalists in the Commune were not representatives of the International. But after the defeat, Karl Marx, in the name of the General Council of the International, issued a manifesto in honour of the Paris of the labouring men and the martyrs of the labouring classes. The International, having rendered itself conjointly responsible with the Commune, was treated as insurrectionist. In France the Assembly passed a special law against it in 1872; in England the workingmen abandoned it. It was left almost without supporters, except in Germany, Belgium, Switzerland, and the southern countries.

Meanwhile it was disorganized by an internal struggle. A Russian refugee in Switzerland, Bakounine, a revolutionist of '48, now an anarchist, had joined the International in 1868; he had just founded a federative society, the *International Alliance of the Social Democracy*, under the direction of a central committee established at Geneva, of which he himself was the head (see his program on p. 735). Its members belonged to the countries of the Romance languages—Italy, Spain, Belgium, and the Italian and French portions of Switzerland. He insisted on having it join the International, while preserving its own organization. The General Council replied that sections could be admitted, but not a federation. Bakounine decided to dissolve his *Alliance* and enter the sections separately into the International (1869). But the federation between them still existed secretly, and soon came into conflict with the General Council of the International on the questions of a congress of the Romance federation in 1870, and the terrorist propaganda of Netchajew in Russia (see p. 606). This was a contest between two revolutionary leaders, Bakounine and Marx,—between two groups of people, the men of the Romance languages, attached to Bakounine, and the men of the

North supporting Marx,—between two programs, Marx' collectivism and Bakounine's anarchism,—between two policies, Marx' legal political action and Bakounine's abstention from the polls and violent revolution,—between two organizations: Marx wished to strengthen the General Council for the general direction of the International; Bakounine to reduce it to the rôle of a "letter box," leaving each section independent.

The annual Congress of the International had been prevented in 1870 and 1871 by the war and the prosecution of the German socialists. The Congress of 1872, held at The Hague, had to decide between the two rivals; the struggle began with the proposal made by Bakounine's supporters to suppress the authority of the General Council; the Marxist majority were resolved, on the contrary, that the Council should have the right to suspend a section or even a federation. They voted to exclude Bakounine and the former members of the Alliance and transfer the session of the Council to New York. The Blanquists withdrew from the International, reproaching it with deserting the field of battle; there remained only the English, Germans, and Americans, who held one more congress, in 1873 at Geneva, and finally declared the association dissolved in 1876.

The International disappeared without having accomplished any positive results. Founded to secure social reforms by international agreement, it had succeeded only in alarming the governments and the public. This was the last attempt at international party organization.

Formation of the Socialist Platform in Germany (1863-75).—While the International was trying to create an international party of social revolution, a national socialist party was being formed in Germany, with a platform and an organization which furnished a model for all Europe.

The Socialist party was founded by Lassalle (see p. 479), an old revolutionist of '48, who began with political conferences in connection with the conflict at Berlin (1862). The new generation of workingmen were ignorant of socialistic theories, but they were beginning to discuss means of improving their condition. A committee was formed at Leipzig to organize a workingmen's congress in which to discuss their interests. This committee consulted Lassalle, who replied with an "open letter," in March, 1863. He urged labouring men to form a workingmen's party independent of the middle-class parties, in order to gain control of political power. Their aim should be to escape the "iron law

of wages," which causes the wages of the labourer to be always reduced by competition to the minimum necessary for existence. Workingmen can rise out of their condition neither by the individual effort which the economists inculcate, nor even by private association (co-operative societies, syndicates, credit societies); they must have assistance from the state. The practical method is to create clubs of productive workmen with state appropriations. But to secure this appropriation they must gain political control and as a first condition demand universal suffrage. Lassalle thus revived Louis Blanc's ideas, universal suffrage and national workshops. He also revived the old name of *social democrat*. But he combined the socialistic doctrines of '48 with the theories of official political authority. This is what he calls "being armed with all the science of the epoch." (The "iron law of wages" was a theory of the liberal economists, first formulated by Turgot.)

Lassalle at first won the workmen of the manufacturing regions of the Rhine, and the Leipzig Congress created the "General Union of German Workingmen" (May, 1863). This was strongly centralized under the direction of a president elected for five years. Lassalle, elected president, went to Berlin to struggle against the progressist party and entered into relations with Bismarck (see p. 479). After his death, in 1864, his party remained a German patriotic party at once monarchical and democratic, with a limited socialist program.

The Marx party was organized later. It began with the secession of the Germans of the International from Lassalle's national party, which was accused of having sold itself to the Prussian government. It was formed by the conversion to socialism of the societies in Saxony (see p. 479), which joined the International in 1868.

The party was constituted at the Eisenach Congress in 1869, where the first complete socialist program was drawn up. The majority (262 against 110) belonged to Marx' disciples; it reproduced his doctrines and formulæ. Marx, who had just published his system in the first volume of "Capital" (1867), proceeded like Lassalle, giving to his socialist doctrines of 1848 the form of a scientific system. His theory of value rested on the official doctrine of 1848 that value is the product of labour. He avoided the sentimental and Utopian allurements of the former socialists. The doctrine remained otherwise the same as in 1848, very different from the old Babouvist communism, which imposed a sharing of

goods and a common life. Marx limited himself to making the means of *production* common property. *Communism*, out of favour since 1848, was replaced by *collectivism*.

The party took the name of the *social democratic party of workmen*, the old name of '48. The platform was divided into three parts: 1. the object; 2. the principles which the members promised to maintain;* 3. the immediate practical program. The doctrine is that of the manifesto of 1848: class strife, conquest of political power to attain a social revolution, international understanding. The immediate program is that of the radical democratic party,† with the addition of certain social reforms: limitation of the working day, diminution of labour for women, prohibition of child labour, single progressive tax on income and inheritance, state appropriations to associations of producers (this last article to win Lassalle's supporters).

The organization was federative, opposed to that of Lassalle. Bebel declared that they wished to prevent "faith in authority" and "personal creeds." The members from a single city met without forming a permanent society to escape the laws against associations, and chose a trustworthy man to convoke the meetings and collect the subscriptions. Each year the elected delegates met in congress to regulate general affairs. The congress

* 1. The object is "the creation of the free democratic state" (*Volksstaat*).

The principles are: "The existing social and political conditions are unjust in the highest degree, and should be fought with the greatest energy. The struggle for the emancipation of the labouring class is a struggle . . . for equality in rights and duties and the abolition of all class domination. . . . The party seeks in abolishing the existing system of production (the wages system) to secure through associated labour the full product of his toil for each workman. Political liberty is the most indispensable condition for economic emancipation . . . the social question . . . can be resolved only in a democratic state. Political and economic emancipation of the labouring class is possible only if it fights for it in common. Emancipation is neither local nor national, but a social problem. . . . The party considers itself a branch of the International."

† Universal suffrage at 21 years of age in all elections (universal suffrage exists in Germany only for the Reichstag, and only for men over 25 years of age),—pay for representatives,—direct legislation (referendum),—abolition of all privileges of class, property, birth, or religion,—national militia,—separation of Church and state,—lay school, compulsory in the primary degree and free to all,—free justice, with juries and oral procedure,—liberty of the press, of meetings, and of unions,—abolition of indirect taxes.

appointed an executive committee of 5 members under the supervision of a controlling committee of 11 members, the two residing in two different cities. There was a party organ, supported by subscription.

The two German socialist parties held separate congresses, presented separate candidates, and fought against each other until 1875; but associations being prosecuted and dissolved in Prussia under the law against the union (*Verband*) of political societies, they united in one party, the *socialist party of the workingmen of Germany*. Their common platform, set up at Gotha in 1875, may be divided into two parts, an exposition of doctrine and a program. The doctrine* was that of the Marxist program of 1869, stated precisely and combined with the Lassalle formulæ, without thought for the contradictions: "labour the sole origin of wealth" and "the iron law of wages,"—"creation of associations of production with government aid," and "emancipation of the labouring classes by the formation of a political workingmen's party,"—the "international character of the movement" and "action within national lines."†

The program is in two parts: 1. the political ideal, "foundation of the state": universal suffrage, direct legislation, militia; complete liberty of the press, of association and public meeting, justice by the people, universal and gratuitous education, religion declared a private matter (this is the democratic program of 1869); 2. immediate social reforms (in existing society): extension of rights in the idealistic sense, progressive income tax, freedom of coalition, length of day fixed by law, interdiction of child labour, laws for the protection of the workingman, sanitary

* Marx wrote his partisans a violent letter against this conciliatory program: it was not made public until 1890, in the *Neue Zeit*.

† These are the principal passages: "Labour is the source of all wealth . . . and is possible only through society. The whole product of labour therefore belongs to society, that is, to all its members, with universal duty of labour and equal rights; to each, according to his reasonable wants. . . Emancipation of labour demands the transformation of the means of labour into the common property of society, the corporative regulation of all labour. . . It must be the work of the labouring class, in the face of which all other classes are only a reactionary mass. The party. . . will try all legal means of securing a free state and socialistic society, the breaking down of the iron law of wages by the abolition of the wages system of labour, the suppression of employment in every form, the disappearance of all social and political inequality. The party . . . though acting primarily within national lines, is conscious of the international character of the movement."

control of factories, mines, and lodgings, liability of the employer, regulation of prison labour.

The organization was federative, similar to that of the Marxists in 1869: local self-governing groups; an annual congress of delegates, invested with sovereign power; a government composed of 3 organs—a directory (*Vorstand*) of 5 members, a board of control of 7 members sitting in another city, a commission of 18 members to serve as arbiter between the two; a party publication and a fund.

The doctrine differed little from the manifesto of 1848, the organization resembled that of the International. Marx' attempt, which had failed under the name of communism and the form of an international society, finally succeeded under the name of collectivism and the form of a national party. The creation of this party in Germany was an international event. For the first time in a great state a socialist workingmen's party was formed, directed by a permanent organization,—a central government, an annual congress, and an official organ,—maintaining a regular budget, working in the name of a definite program, at once doctrinal and practical, and holding a permanent place among political parties. This German party was to furnish a model to the socialists of other countries; as it preserved the international spirit of its founder, it revived by example and propaganda the work the International had failed to accomplish.

The Anarchist Parties.—The words *anarchy* and *anarchist* were for a long time only injurious terms applied to revolutionists by their enemies. Proudhon first gave the name of *anarchy* to his system. In so far as a positive formula may be deduced from his works, which are mainly critical and controversial, his ideal was a federation of voluntary associations of workingmen and farmers without political government. Among the revolutionists between 1840 and 1848, some showed a similar tendency, but they did not form a party (Hess and Grün in Germany, Marr in Switzerland).

The creator of the anarchist party was Bakounine, a Russian officer and militant revolutionist who had become a disciple of Proudhon during his stay in Paris (1843-47). He took from Proudhon the idea of anarchy and federation, but he added to it hatred of civilized institutions and systematic calls for violence to destroy them. He declared the oppressed classes incapable of emancipating themselves; if they should reconstruct a new society they would make it as oppressive as the old one. It was

therefore necessary to avoid every positive creation and simply "unchain all the so-called evil passions and destroy all of what is known as public order." The tactics must consist in exciting riots.

The *Alliance of the Social Democracy* founded by Bakounine in 1868 had secret statutes and an anarchistic program; it demanded not only full equality for all and collective ownership of land and the implements of labour, but "universal revolution—social, philosophic, economic, and political." Its aim was to destroy all the governments and all the churches, together with their religious, political, financial, judicial, police, university, economic, and social institutions."

In 1869 the Alliance joined the International, then left it with Bakounine in 1872. It was composed of revolutionists of the Romanic countries, the most unruly and violent members of the International, the Italian section, the Spanish section that took part in the cantonalist insurrections (see p. 313), a Belgian section, and the *Jura Federation*, recruited among the clock-makers in the canton of Neuchâtel, a small but very active section. It held congresses in 1872, '73, '74, '76, and '77.

Few in number and sharply combated by the socialists, the anarchists gained almost no members except in the countries where the socialist party had not yet been organized. They did, however, acquire a political influence disproportionate to their numbers by adopting the methods of the Russian terrorists—the commission of murder and outrage by means of explosives. This method they exalted into a theory, which has given them universal notoriety. The revolutionary parties had heretofore employed acts of violence only to produce a decisive effect by destroying some objectionable individual. The anarchists valued acts of violence as a means of publicity, committing them in order to attract the attention of the public to the vices of society and force it to reflect. This was *propagation by facts*.

The anarchist party, by the very nature of its policy, was unable to make itself a permanent party. As soon as an active group was formed in a country, it made itself conspicuous by its actions, and was quickly exterminated. There remained only the anarchist writers, whom the governments tolerated and surrounded with spies. In addition to this, the majority of anarchists, both by temperament and doctrine, refused to recognise even voluntary authority. They formed "groups" of "comrades" rather than parties and did not work in harmony. In

fact their political influence was limited to the reactions brought on by their propaganda of outrage, and their history was nothing but a recital of individual demonstrations in different countries.

The remnants of the *Alliance* and the Paris "group" held at London in 1881 a congress which declared it "necessary to use all possible means to spread actively revolutionary ideas and the spirit of revolt among the masses, who as yet take no active part in the movement and delude themselves on the morality and efficacy of legal methods." It recommended the study of chemistry, "which has already rendered great service to the revolutionary cause."

An anarchist movement was made in France from 1872 to 1882, in the southeast and in Paris. It was chiefly noticeable for the doctrinal teachings of two writers, Kropotkin and E. Reclus, and for the Lyons explosion, followed by prompt repression (1882).

The anarchist movement produced in Austria by Most and Peukert (1882-85) was crushed by special laws and arrests *en masse*. The last anarchist movements were produced at Paris from 1892 to 1894, in Italy, and in Spain. In the German countries the movement was checked by the socialist party. In England, London served as a refuge for foreign anarchists, but no anarchistic acts were perpetrated there.

Formation of the National Socialist Parties.—The German socialists, in order to gain the political power necessary for social revolution, had provisionally renounced the international organization and had constituted themselves as a national party with an electoral and parliamentary organization.

The other countries have gradually imitated them. Evolution was at first retarded by the anarchists' resistance to the *Alliance*, then by internal divisions among the socialists, and the repressive measures taken by the governments. But almost everywhere a socialist workingmen's party has been formed on the model of the German party and with a similar program. In Austria, after the destruction of the anarchists, the "social democratic workingmen's party" was constituted in 1888, with an international* collectivist program and an organization composed as in Germany of a congress, a directory, and a board of control. It has

*"The party . . . is an international party; it condemns the privilege of nations, as well as those of birth, sex, and property, and declares that the struggle against exploitation must be international like exploitation itself"

especially made demonstrations in favour of universal suffrage and the eight-hour day. In the three Scandinavian countries, Holland, and Belgium, the party has been constructed after the German model. In Poland the party, formed in 1882 in the manufacturing cities of Russian Poland, was crushed in 1885. It was revived in 1892-93 with a collectivist platform copied from Germany; but this is a party of Polish patriots who demand the reconstitution of Poland as a democratic republic. In France and the Romanic countries the collectivist ideas have gradually permeated all the revolutionary parties; but they have not adopted a regular organization and a central management.

The German party, obliged to dissolve its official organization and to hold its congresses abroad (see p. 479) while the special laws were in force (1878-90), took advantage of the return to ordinary law to reorganize. It took the name of the social democratic party (1890), restored the organization by local groups (ordinarily constituted in the form of electoral committees), and decided to push socialist propagandism in the rural districts. The Congress of Erfurt, in 1891, revised the program, suppressing the passages which recalled Lassalle's doctrine and developing much more broadly Marx' theory that natural evolution will do away with private property and prepare for collectivism. The party set itself the task of organizing class struggles by arousing the workingmen to the necessity of contest. To this main object they have added emancipation of women, free medical care, and free burials. In labour legislation they demand extension to farm labourers and domestic servants of the measures taken for the factory operatives.

Thus in the majority of the European states socialist parties have been created, with a democratic constitution, composed of two organs: an annual congress of elected representatives, a sovereign deliberative assembly which determines the program and general policy; a permanent committee chosen by the congress and charged with the executive functions. It is a complete government provided with the means of practical action: a fund, an organ, and an electoral organization. Each party is constituted within the lines of a single nation, since it has to act through a single parliament. There are, indeed, in some countries several rival socialist parties.

The socialist doctrine rests on the same principles everywhere. The existing economic system is unfavourable to the labouring class; the reform must be the work of the labouring class; it will

be accomplished by gaining political control and employing the power of the state to establish the collective ownership of instruments of production, including the soil.

The practical reforms aimed at are political and social. Their political program is the former radical democratic program, pushed to the farthest logical consequences: absolute equality, meaning universal suffrage, even for women; equal military service; complete instruction for all; absolute liberty, meaning liberty of the press, of public meeting and association; the complete separation of Church and state; complete laicization; absolute fraternity, meaning general peace, disarmament, no more distinction between natives and foreigners, international regulation of all common affairs.

The socialist party takes the title *democratic*; it is from the democratic parties that it draws its members, it is from the democratic doctrine as a starting-point that it goes on to demand a social revolution. In Germany and Austria, it holds the position of radical party. In the countries with restricted suffrage, Austria, the Scandinavian states, Holland, and Italy, it demands universal suffrage, as the socialists demanded it in France prior to 1848, in Germany prior to 1866, and in Belgium prior to 1893.

The socialist program aims at practical reforms in detail to improve the condition of the labouring classes (syndicates, legislation in favour of the workingman, regulation of wages and the length of the working day, superannuation fund), and measures to begin economic transformation in the collectivist sense (socialization of railroads, mines, and insurance, progressive income tax). The program also keeps in view the ultimate goal of complete collectivism, as an aim to be realized in the future.

Altogether it is a political, democratic, levelling, liberal, lay, pacific, democratic program, joined to a program of eventual state socialism, working through legislation and taxation. Of these two independent programs it is difficult to determine which attracts the more members to the socialist parties.

Policy of the Revolutionary Parties.—During the first half of the century revolutionary parties knew no means of action but violent revolution, such as Mazzini's conspiracies in Italy and Blanqui's insurrectional uprisings in France. All their successes in that period were due to revolt, in the army or in the capital.

In the second half of the century the governments being better armed (see p. 674), the revolutionists have conceived a different policy, namely, peaceful propagandism to attain legal acquisition

of power. The association founded by Lassalle declared in its statutes in 1863 that its object was to work by "peaceful and legal means," by winning public favour. The Marxist socialist party, even while announcing their purpose of establishing the dictatorship of the proletariat, made it a rule to avoid outbreaks. The doctrine of natural evolution toward the collectivist system, inculcated among the socialists by Marx, turned them from sudden revolution, which was useless as it was premature and dangerous because it might cause the destruction of the party. The Gotha program of 1875 declared that the party was acting "by all legal means," and this clause was suppressed in 1880 only in response to the special law of 1878, which made even the propagation of socialistic doctrines illegal.

What policy must it adopt to prepare the way for social revolution? This is the question that has dominated the policy of the revolutionary parties, that has caused almost all their internal discord, their ruptures and division into groups.

The radical democratic party has lost all revolutionary character, except in Russia, and has become a parliamentary party. It proceeds by proposing reforms in detail through legislation and by endeavouring to gain a parliamentary majority and thereby the ministry.

Certain socialist revolutionary parties have also detached themselves, at the other extreme—notably, the anarchist party. In the negative criticism of society the anarchists agree with the socialists; they long talked the same language and worked in harmony, and the public continues to confound them together as equally hostile to existing social order. But difference in temperament has led them to radically different policies. Common action has now become impossible; an irreconcilable enmity has arisen between them.

The anarchists, unwilling to bind themselves to a party discipline in order to prepare a revolution which would not bring absolute liberty to the individual, refused to join in any political action, scorned elections and assemblies and recommended violent action to rouse public opinion. Those of them who wished to act, employed the criminal tactics of the Russian terrorists. The German socialists expressly condemned these methods in 1887.*

* "Force is a factor as reactionary as revolutionary, and even more often the former than the latter. The policy of the individual use of force does not accomplish its object; and, wounding as it does the sense of popular rights, it is positively injurious, and therefore to be condemned."

The socialists have taken a stand halfway between the radical democrats and the anarchists, thus avoiding both purely parliamentary action and violent action. But this general principle, variously interpreted, has led to various tactics: of these at least three may be distinguished—two extreme, leading the one toward radical, the other toward anarchistic methods; the third, a sort of mean between these two.

1. The official policy of the German Marxist parties has consisted in the adoption of the forms of parliamentary political parties, but only as a means of spreading socialistic doctrines. The party presents candidates at the elections, sends deputies to the political assemblies, and organizes them in a parliamentary group; but in entering the electoral and parliamentary arena of middle-class society, it declares that it does not count on elections or assemblies to bring about social reform. It sees in them only a means of publishing its ideas, of agitating public opinion, of gaining adherents, of organizing them and counting them, caring more for the total number of socialist votes than for the number of deputies elected. It regards assemblies as a platform from which to set forth its doctrines, refuses to take part in parliamentary work by proposing slight social reforms, and avoids relations with other parties. But it recommends abstention from any revolutionary movement which might give the government a pretext for crushing the party. This is a policy of revolutionary agitation by parliamentary processes, the object of which is a peaceful realization of a complete revolution.

2. On the left, making the transition toward anarchy, comes the policy of revolutionary abstention destined to prepare a sudden revolution. It consists in avoiding contact with electoral and parliamentary life which would involve compromises, cause principles to be forgotten and revolutionists to mingle with society by accustoming them to that of the middle class. The party must therefore abstain from every regular political act and hold itself ready for revolution. As to the means of bringing about the revolution opinions diverge: the Blanquists have clung to the old policy of civil war, which becomes more and more impracticable; others prefer economic war, a *general strike*. This is a policy of extra-parliamentary agitation, looking forward to a complete revolution by force.

3. On the right, making the transition toward the political radicals, has appeared more recently a group advocating a policy of gradual progress and of compromise. While waiting for the

chance to realize the whole ideal, this group is willing to realize fragments of it in the form of laws. It is therefore willing to enter into parliamentary life, to make terms with parties hostile to social revolution, and induce them to accept partial social reforms. To attract voters, it has begun to present programs reduced to certain practical reforms without doctrinal character. In order to reassure rural voters, in particular, it has come to abandon the principle of collectivism of all instruments of production. It would admit small individual ownership for the peasant who cultivates his land himself. This is a policy of parliamentary action with a view to a gradual social reform.

The socialist parties have had to choose between these policies, and that which each has adopted has determined its general attitude in political life: abstention, entrance into politics as a means of agitation, entrance into politics in contact with non-socialist parties. Altogether they have tended to gravitate from the policy of the Left to that of the Right, passing through the intermediate stage of primitive Marxism; but the parties of the different policies have been preserved in each country, and remain rivals.

The policy of semi-anarchistic revolutionary abstention has been that of the old parties, small in numbers, who can hope for nothing except through a surprise; its supporters have been reduced to petty groups, impatient at delay or dissatisfied with the conduct of socialist representatives forced to mingle with other members of parliament. This is the attitude of certain French groups, *Blanquists* and *Allemanists*;^{*} of a fraction of the Dutch socialist party, and of a small Berlin group of *Independents* or *Striplings*, as they were called, who accused the party leaders of having killed the revolutionary spirit and made the socialist party a mere reform party. This group was expelled by the Congress of 1891.

The Marxist policy was that of a *doctrinaire* party, confident of ultimate triumph and fearing to retard it by any imprudence, but reproached by all other parties and replying to their scorn with violent language and systematic abstention from parliamentary action. The system of special laws prolonged this attitude in Germany. But since the abandonment of special laws, the German party, while fully retaining the principle of its tradi-

^{*} A fusion with the anarchists was attempted, under the name of *liberty-loving communism*.

ional policy, has inclined toward the policy of the socialist Right.*

The policy of gradual reform had, in 1882, been adopted by the majority of the labouring men's party, which led to the rupture between the *possibilists* and the Orthodox Marxist group (see p. 217). Since the official reconciliation of 1893 it has been the prevailing policy. It has succeeded in forming, under the name of *radical socialists*, a group which makes a connecting link between the socialists and the main body of the republican party. It showed itself at the Congress of Nantes in 1894, by the adoption of a program of land reforms destined to attract the peasants by assuring to them the preservation of peasant properties, and enrolling them against "the common enemy, the feudalism of large land-holding." This is also the policy of the English *Fabians Society*. The Belgian socialists have in like manner entered into relations with the progressist party. In Germany, this policy has been discussed, since 1891, in the party congresses. Vollmar, leader of the Bavarian socialists, wished in 1891 to discuss in the *Reichstag* bills drawn up in the interest of the labouring man. The leaders of the party, Bebel and Liebknecht, opposed this in the name of maintaining a class struggle against the ruling classes and the state. By abandoning this struggle for the sake of a single practical aim, it would become a mere party of opportunity. The Congress avoided committing itself. The South German socialists adopted a policy similar to that of the French radical socialists; their deputies to the Bavarian *Landtag* refused to reject the budget in the lump (1894). In the same year the Frankfort Congress decided to leave the socialists in each state free to choose their own policy. A plan for land reform, designed to attract the peasants, was rejected by the Congress of 1895; but the Bavarian socialists continued to agitate in this direction and the Halle Congress of 1896 again discussed this policy without reaching a definite conclusion.

The International Socialist Congresses.—Since the dissolution of the International the national socialist parties have attempted to maintain the international understanding by congresses in

* "While the conquest of political power cannot be the work of a moment, nor the outcome of a momentarily successful surprise, but can be secured only by persistent labour and by skilful use of all means of spreading our ideas,—resolved that there is no reason to alter the policy of the party."

which a program of social reforms of general interest is theoretically discussed. But the practical question that dominates the deliberations is to decide on what conditions the delegates may be admitted to sit in the Congress, that is, whether delegates from the anarchist groups should be refused or admitted. This is the ground of dispute between the semi-anarchistic socialists and the "authoritarians" or Marxists.

The first Congress, at Ghent in 1877, was a victory for the "authoritarians." The anarchists had been admitted to it, and another attempt at conciliation was made. The organization of production was discussed; the anarchists proposed their ideal of free productive groups keeping in harmony with each other by force of common interest without any higher power over them. The Authoritarians carried the principle that the state, representative of the whole people, "should own the land and the instruments of labour." They also pronounced labour-unions "one of the most efficacious means in the struggle of labourers against being exploited by capitalists."

The Congress of 1881, whose meeting at Zurich was prevented by the government, was reduced to the Conference of Coire, which was not large enough to take action. The meetings of 1883 and 1886 were reduced to conferences held at Paris by French Possibilists and English delegates from the trade unions; the Marxists refused to consider them real congresses.

The division of French socialists was shown by the two congresses held at Paris on the same day, July 14, 1889. One, convoked by the Possibilists and chiefly French (524 French delegates out of 606), demanded "complete education," minimum wage, and workshops supported by the government. The other, that of the Marxists (221 French delegates out of 395), voted the Marxist doctrine, equal pay for women, liberty of coalition, resolutions in favour of the eight-hour day, prohibition of labour of children and women, prohibition of unhealthy and night labour, rest of thirty-six consecutive hours each week, suppression of employment offices and employers' bureaus, and the creation of factory boards of inspection, composed one-half of workingmen. It invited the proletarians of all nations to organize an international demonstration for the eight-hour day, on the Labour festival of May 1. It condemned standing armies and made a demonstration at the graves of the "martyrs of the Commune."

The Congress of Brussels, in 1891, demanded, for admission,

that delegates should declare their recognition of "the necessity of political struggle," which shut out the anarchists. It congratulated itself on the influence exercised by the Congress of 1889, which had caused Emperor William to call together the international conference of 1890 to consider labour legislation. It complained that the laws for the protection of the labouring man were ill applied, decided upon an investigation of the conditions of the labouring class, and invited the labourers of the whole world to use their political rights to free themselves from the bondage of the wage system. It refused even to discuss anti-Semitism, resting on the principle of all socialist parties, who "do not recognise any antipathies of nations or races, but only a struggle of the wage-earning class of all countries against the capitalist class of all countries." It undertook to organize itself in syndicates to direct the struggle. The Marxist majority rejected the proposition, made by Domela Nieuwenhuis, to reply, in case of a declaration of war, by a general strike.

The Congress of Zurich in 1893 (440 delegates) excluded the anarchists, who demanded admission because their methods also constituted a form of political influence. It passed resolutions regarding the festival of May 1, the eight-hour day, the political tactics of the socialists, the organization of syndicates, and the attitude to be taken in case of war. It rejected the general strike and confined itself to inviting the socialist deputies to vote against any war budget and to demand disarmament. In order to cut short attempts at agrarian conciliation, it voted the principle of the collective ownership of the soil.

The Congress of London in 1896 (800 delegates) excluded the anarchists; the minority, which had voted to admit them (144 votes against 223), was a coalition of the opponents of the Marxists, chiefly English and French. The Congress voted resolutions in favour of universal suffrage, the referendum, emancipation of women, nationalization of railroads, mines, and factories, and abolition of customs duties; against standing armies and colonial expansion.

BIBLIOGRAPHY.

BIBLIOGRAPHY.—*Stammhammer*, "Bibliographie des Sozialismus," 1895, in alphabetical order. It is more practicable to have recourse to the bibl. of the "*Handwörterbuch der Staatswissenschaften*," 6 vols., 1890-94, and Suppl., 1895, under the words Anarchismus, Sozialdemokratie, Internationale, and names of the persons concerned.

DOCUMENTS.—The principal documents, beside the writings of heads

of revolutionary schools and parties, are chiefly reports of party meetings published in the party organs or in special pamphlets (for Germany, the *Vorwärts* catalogue), which it would be impossible to enumerate (see the bibl. of **G. Adler**, articles on *Sozialdemokratie*, mentioned above). The most important periodicals are the *Vorwärts*, the *Sozialdemokrat*, the "Jahrbuch für Sozialwissenschaft u. Sozialpolitik," which lasted two years, 1879-81, and *Die Neue Zeit*; in France the *Revue Socialiste*.

WORKS.—For revolutionary movements other than socialistic: **Deschamps**, "Les Sociétés Secrètes et la Révolution," 2 vols., 3d ed., 1880; **Claudio Jannet**, vol. iii., sub-titled "Notes et Documents," s. d. (1883), a confused, passionate, and uncritical work, based on documents and previous works on Free Masonry, Carbonarism, Mazzini, etc. The chief works are: **Diamilla-Müller**, "Politica Segreta Italiana," 1880; **Menacci**, "Memorie Docum. p. la Storia della Revol. Ital.," 1879; **Th. Frost**, "The Secret Societies of the European Revolution," 2 vols., 1876.

For the socialist parties, full histories are books for the people: **Laveleye**, "Le Socialisme Contemporain," 10th ed., 1896; clear and instructive (original details on the southern countries).—**B. Malon**, "Hist. du Socialisme," 5 vols., 1880-85, uncritical compilation, but may be found useful.—**Stegemann** and **Hugo**, "Handbuch des Sozialismus," 1894-95, socialistic, in dictionary form, gives a great mass of information, but unfortunately no references.

On the period preceding 1848: **Stein**, "Gesch. der Sozialen Bewegung in Frankreich," 3 vols., 1850 (a revision of "Sozialismus und Communismus des Heutigen Frankreichs," 2 vols., 1848), is so far the most complete work for France.—**G. Adler**, "Gesch. der ersten Sozialpolitischen Arbeiterbewegung in Deutschland," 1885, for Germany.

On the International and the foundation of the German parties, in addition to the biographies of Lassalle and Marx (mentioned in the "Handwörterbuch des Staatswissenschaft."), the chief history is: **R. Meyer**, "Der Emancipationskampf des Vierten Standes," 2 vols., 1874-75 (socialistic conservative).

On the recent period: **Zacher**, "L'International Rouge," 1885.—**Winterer**, "Le Socialisme International," 1890.—**J. Bourdeau**, "Le Socialisme Allemand et le Nihilisme Russe," 1892 (popular edit.).—**Wyzewa**, "Le Mouvement Socialiste en Europe," 1892 (popular edit.).

On anarchy, no complete history: **G. Adler**, art. Anarchismus, mentioned above, 1890 and 1895, gives a review and a detailed bibl.—**E. Zenker**, "Der Anarchismus," 1895.

For socialist doctrines, the "Handwörterbuch der Staatswiss." gives, under the name of each author, the bibl. of his works in great detail, and a very accurate *résumé* of his theories. The best full expositions of the socialist ideal are: **Schaeffle**, "Quintessenz des Sozialismus," 1875, Fr. trans., 1886; and especially **A. Menger**, "Das Recht auf den Vollen Arbeitsertrag," 1886, 2d-ed., 1891, a masterpiece of logic and clearness.

For the history of socialist parties in each country see the bibliog. of the different countries.

CHAPTER XXV.

EUROPE UNDER THE METTERNICH SYSTEM,* 1815-30.

European Questions in 1815.—The great powers had, in 1814 and 1815, regulated the whole organization of Europe, the division of territory, and even the internal government (see chap. i.), and had agreed together to maintain this regulation. Europe of "the treaties of 1815" rested on a permanent alliance of five great states, designed to defend the European balance of power and the legitimate monarchies, that is, to prevent the return of the revolutionary governments and the French wars of conquest.

All these states were aristocratic monarchies: three absolutist, Russia, Austria, and Prussia; the other two constitutional, England and France, but with executive governments that were masters of foreign policy. All decisions depended, therefore, on a very small number of men, the sovereigns and their ministers; the personal sentiments, impressions, and wills of these few decided the fate of Europe. All were not actually of the same weight. The King of France and his ministers, absorbed by domestic affairs and dominated by the necessity of peace; the English statesmen of the Tory party, advocates of the *status quo* and indifferent to continental affairs; the King of Prussia, timid, hesitating, docile to the counsels of Metternich, all desired to

* In these last chapters (xxv.-xxviii.) on the relations between the states, I have deliberately broken away from the traditional custom of introducing into political history the recital of the details of war and diplomatic negotiations. These details, indispensable to technical histories of the art of war and diplomacy written for specialists, generals, and diplomats, have seemed to me out of place in a general history; they are no aid to the understanding of political evolution. I relate here, in regard to diplomatic and military events, only what is strictly necessary to explain how questions of foreign policy have arisen, in what form and by what means they have been settled. The wars which have had a direct effect upon internal policy have been already described in the history of each country; there remain here only international events.

avoid foreign complications and pursued only a passive policy. The only governments capable of taking the initiative and able to impose a policy on the others were the two empires of Russia and Austria, which practically meant Alexander I. and Metternich. On their harmony or discord depended the policy of the great powers, and consequently the decision of European affairs.

As early as 1815 a number of questions began to occupy the diplomatists. 1. France had joined the alliance, but the Hundred Days had given the impression that her legitimate government was threatened. Must she be freely admitted to the European concert or kept under surveillance and controlled in her domestic affairs? This was the French question, which was settled at the Congress of Aix-la-Chapelle.

2. The Allies had guaranteed each state its territory, but not its internal government. Must they be left to establish new constitutions or should the Allies intervene to maintain absolute monarchy? This was the *intervention* question, decided in connection with the Italian revolutions.

3. The Allies had guaranteed the maintenance of all territory in Europe except the Ottoman Empire. Must they also maintain the integrity of the Sultan's territory? This was the Eastern question, already brought up at the Congress of Vienna, where the Tsar refused to have it discussed. It was to come up again with the Greek insurrection.

4. The Allies had decided nothing about the American colonies. Should they intervene to subject the Spanish colonies? The question arose in 1815 and was not decided until the Congress of Verona.

The Holy Alliance (1815).—The treaties of 1815 had been purely political acts, with no religious character. Alexander, influenced by Christian mysticists,* wished to re-enforce the political alliance of the sovereigns by a religious alliance. The King of Prussia, bound to him by ties of friendship during the campaigns of 1813 to 1815, and being personally a very religious man, approved this plan. The Emperor of Austria accepted it out of politeness to the Tsar. The three sovereigns, meeting once more in France, concluded a compact which was solemnly published, under the name of the *Holy Alliance*, September 26, 1815.

* He was at this time subject to Mme. de Krüdener, whose acquaintance he had made in May, 1815; she was a mysticist, born at Riga, in the Baltic provinces, and had passed some years in Switzerland.

This treaty, unprecedented in European diplomacy, began with an invocation to "the most holy and indivisible Trinity," and contained simply religious declarations and moral pledges. "Having acquired the intimate conviction that it is necessary to base the course to be pursued by the powers in their mutual relations on the sublime truths which are taught by the eternal religion of God the Preserver of mankind, the sovereigns solemnly declare that the present act is only to show, in the face of the world, their invincible determination to take for their rule of conduct . . . only the precepts of that holy religion, the precepts of justice, charity, and peace, which, far from being applicable only to private life, should, on the contrary, influence the resolutions of princes and guide all their steps.

"In conformity with the words of Holy Scripture, which order all men to regard themselves as brethren, the three contracting monarchs will live united by the bonds of a true and indissoluble fraternity; and on every occasion and in every place they will lend each other aid and succor; regarding themselves in relation to their subjects as fathers of families, they will direct them in the same spirit of fraternity . . . to protect religion, peace, and justice. The only working principle between the governments or their subjects will be to render reciprocal service, . . . to consider themselves all as members of a single Christian nation, the three allied princes considering themselves only as agents of Providence to govern three branches of the same family . . . thus confessing that the Christian nation of which they and their peoples form a part has really no other sovereign but . . . God, our divine Saviour Jesus Christ, the Word of the Most High, the Word of Life."

This was a compact of Christian fraternity opposed to revolutionary fraternity, but concluded outside of the churches, in the name of the peoples, by the sovereigns, "the agents of Providence." This Holy Alliance between three princes of rival faiths, one Catholic, one schismatic, one heretic, was not pleasing to the court of Rome. A notable Catholic writer, J. de Maistre, denounced it as filled with the "spirit of *visionaries* . . . who opposed *religiousness to religion*"; the true title should have been: "Convention by which the princes declare that all Christians are but one family professing the same religion, and that the different denominations that distinguish them signify nothing." It was, in fact, a demonstration of *indifferentism*, a heresy condemned by the Church.

The treaty invited the other powers to join this Holy Alliance and "to confess solemnly its sacred principles." Louis XVIII. adhered to it out of deference to the Tsar; the majority of sovereigns did likewise. The English government refused, giving as its reason that such a general alliance could not be countersigned by any minister, and every act of the English King must be countersigned by a minister.

The Holy Alliance remained a solemn demonstration without practical result; Metternich called it a "sonorous nothing." It did, however, produce a distinct impression upon the enemies of the Restoration, especially in France. The public confused it with the alliance of the powers against France; it became a common thing to designate the Allies of 1814 by the name of *Holy Alliance*, which became to the liberals a synonym for war against France and liberalism.

Rivalry between Alexander I. and Metternich (1815-18).—The apparent harmony between the governments of the great states concealed a secret struggle between the two men who were then determining the policy of Europe, Alexander and Metternich. They were opposed in character, political ideals, and practical interests.

Alexander, naturally tender, easily influenced, religious, compassionate, was devoted to his duties and open to humanitarian ideas. Educated by a liberal instructor, the Waldensian Laharpe, he held an ideal of constitutional monarchy with predominance of the sovereign, almost the same as the Tory theory. In harmony with England he had assisted in supporting a constitutional system in France and Switzerland, and had himself granted a constitution to his kingdom of Poland.

Metternich, a *blasé* and sceptical diplomat, insensible to pity, followed only the policy of interest, and regarded as the fundamental interest the preservation and support of all existing institutions. "The basis of modern policy is and must be *repose*," he wrote in 1817. An enemy to revolution in all its forms, he declared his preference for aristocratic absolute monarchy, and regarded a constitution as a weapon for revolutionists.

Between Alexander and Metternich the chief ground of dispute was the internal organization of the European states and the attitude toward parties. Alexander supported the liberal constitutionalists, Metternich combated them. The envoys from Russia and Austria to the secondary courts strove against each other by intrigues for influence over the governments. In

Germany the Russian agents supported the princes who wished to grant constitutions to their subjects—Weimar, Wurtemberg, Baden, and Bavaria. Alexander became the protector of the constitutional states of southern Germany; the governments of Baden and Bavaria, contesting for possession of the Palatinate on the right bank of the Rhine, both appealed to him. In Italy, the King of Sardinia, invited by Metternich in 1815 to sign a special treaty with Austria (see p. 329), asked help from England, which advised him to accept; he then appealed to Alexander, who said that the general alliance excluded all separate treaties; thus Austria was defeated in her plan for an Italian confederation under her influence. In Spain, the Russian ambassador, all-powerful with King Ferdinand, maintained, in spite of the absolutist party, the Garay ministry, which was attempting financial reform; overstepping his instructions he promised money and even the acquisition of Portugal and tried to secure for the insurgent American colonies an amnesty and a charter (see p. 290). In France Alexander upheld the ministry of Richelieu (who as governor of Odessa, had spent many years in Russia), in support of the Charter, against the *Introuvable* Chamber, which was trying to force the King to take a ministry of *Ultras* (see p. 117). He sent Louis XVIII. a note against the *Ultra* demonstrations, in which he declared that the object of the treaty of 1815 was to consolidate the order of things established in France in 1814. This was to be done by the inviolable maintenance of royal authority and the observance of the Constitutional Charter. He urged Louis XVIII. to dissolve the Chamber.

In addition to direct intervention with the governments, Alexander was in relations with the notables of the opposition parties; or at least the liberal malcontents gained authority from his name. It was well known that he did not like the Bourbons (see p. 103) and that he favoured religious propaganda outside of the established churches. The Bonapartists, who organized a plot in Belgium, in 1816, to drive out the Bourbons and replace them by the Prince of Orange, the brother-in-law of the Tsar, intimated that the Tsar was friendly to them. In Italy Metternich attributed the liberal and national agitation to Russian emissaries; he accused them later (1819) of "presiding over clubs of *Carbonari*," and complained of the Tsar's encouragement of Bible societies. He wrote to the Emperor of Austria: "Since 1815 Alexander has given up Jacobinism to throw himself into mysti-

cism. Always, as his tendency is constantly revolutionary, his religious sentiments are equally so. . . The desire of making proselytes holds first place in all his calculations. It is in this spirit that he enlists the Jacobins in Italy and the sects in Europe." (Metternich includes under the head of Jacobins all partisans of a constitutional system.) He calls "the attention of cabinets to the progress of the sects which are beginning to menace the peace of central Europe." He regarded Mme. de Krüdener as particularly dangerous "because her preachings are all designed to excite the indigent classes against landowners" (1817).

In the Orient Alexander had pursued a policy of conquest. In Napoleon's time he had already concluded a preliminary alliance between France and Russia, leaving the West to France, on condition of having a free field in the East. He had begun the conquest of the Ottoman Empire in 1806 and had kept a piece of it, Bessarabia. Metternich suspected him of wishing to renew the close alliance with France and to begin conquest once more. Alexander had refused, at the Congress of Vienna, to include the Sultan among the sovereigns whose territory was guaranteed. In reality he was tired of the war on the Danube, as it was breaking up the Russian army; he wanted no further complications on this side; in 1817 he refused to hear the envoy from a Greek patriotic society who had come to implore his assistance.

Congress of Aix-la-Chapelle and Alexander's Conversion (1818).

—The rivalry between Alexander and Metternich had been of profit to the liberals, by diminishing the violence of the absolutist reaction in the countries subject to the Tsar's influence. But little by little Alexander became alarmed at the progress of the liberal parties. Metternich began to gain influence over him and to draw him into supporting the absolutist policy.

Alexander's conversion began on the question of French policy. Since 1815 the Allies had been taking precautions against a return of the Revolution. Their ambassadors in Paris met once a week to talk over the state of affairs in France, give advice to the French government, supervise the payment of the army of occupation, and decide the movements of the troops. The instructions given to Wellington, the commander of the army of occupation, on November 3, 1815, informed him that the Allies had "formally promised King Louis XVIII. the sup-

port of their arms against any revolutionary convulsion" and left the management of the troops to his discretion.

The treaty of November 20, 1815, excluded from the government of France Napoleon and his family "for the general tranquillity of Europe" and established between the four Allies a permanent league of supervision over France. It was agreed "to renew at stated intervals meetings sacred to the great common interests and to the examination of the measures which in each of these periods shall be deemed most salutary to the peace and prosperity of Europe." The idea was to make these congresses a regular institution through which the great powers should control Europe and watch over France.

The first opportunity for holding a congress was the political state of France. The Richelieu ministry implored Alexander to hasten the evacuation of French territory. The English government consented to diminish the army of occupation on payment of a part of the indemnity; France procured the money by a 5 per cent. loan, subscribed for at 55 by an English bank, in February, 1817.

The Allies decided to hold a meeting to settle upon definite terms of evacuation; Alexander proposed a congress like that at Vienna, to which all the states of Europe should be invited. Metternich, in order to avoid the worries he had endured at Vienna, secured the adoption of a conference between the four Allies alone, to which France should be invited.

This conference, wrongly termed the *Congress* of Aix-la-Chapelle, held in November, 1818, was a personal meeting of the three sovereigns of Russia, Austria, and Prussia and of the prime ministers of the five great powers. The four Allies began by agreeing among themselves before admitting France. They arranged terms for evacuation in October. Alexander, already disturbed by the discovery of a secret society of Russian officers, was greatly alarmed by the liberal success at the elections of October in France (he had already advised Louis XVIII. to change the electoral law).* Metternich took advantage of these impressions to secure a secret convention between the four Allies,

An agent of the Ultra party, Vitrolles, sent a note to the Russian ambassador begging the Tsar to check the revolutionary movement by asking the King to change his ministry. A secret note to this effect was communicated to the Decazes ministry. The ministers published it, and accused the Ultras of having conspired against the king; this was the *bord de l'eau* conspiracy of 1818.

November 1. They agreed to use their combined force in case any uprising should succeed in France and threaten the peace or security of her neighbours. England agreed to this only in case a Bonaparte should be placed on the throne.

Having taken their precautions against France, the Allies granted to Richelieu what they had just refused him in October, the admission of France to the Alliance. This was done in the form of a secret protocol (November 15) and a public declaration. The secret agreement provided for war measures in case of a revolution in France, the march of the armies, and the defence of the fortresses. The Tsar even proposed a plan of campaign. After this the conference discussed the affairs of Germany, Spain, and the colonies.

The Conference of Aix-la-Chapelle was a decisive victory for Metternich's policy. The chief result was to proclaim solemnly the maintenance of the Alliance against the revolutionists. "The happiest result," wrote Metternich,* will be *that there is to be no change in the existing order of things*," and it will be "a most brilliant triumph for the Cabinets that have never invoked the spirit of innovation." It was a moral defeat for Alexander, "for the court which has rendered homage to what is called the spirit of the time and which *by its words* has roused the hopes of innovators and sectarians of every description." After the Congress, Metternich wrote: "The Congress has encouraged the friends of order and peace in all nations and everywhere alarmed innovators and factionists."

Alexander's conversion, begun at Aix-la-Chapelle, was completed by the impression of the demonstrations of German students, the elections to the French Chamber in 1819, and especially the murder of his agent Kotzebue (see p. 385). Metternich used these incidents to persuade him of the existence of a "great conspiracy that was spreading all over Germany" and even of a revolutionary organization of the Liberals of all Europe, which was encouraged by the Jacobins (Liberals) who surrounded the King of Prussia, and was directed by the *sects*. He secured the adoption in Germany of measures against the universities and the press. In the case of France it was Alexander himself who proposed intervention. The Decazes ministry,

* The benefit of the Congress of Aix-la-Chapelle to conservative policy is set forth in Metternich's notes and in Gentz's memoirs in a verbose and confident form. ("Metternich Papers," vol. iii.)

abandoned by the Tsar, turned to the English government, which refused to interfere.

Austrian Congresses; the Interventions (1820-23).—The revolutions in Spain and Italy completed Metternich's triumph over Alexander. Within one year four revolutions broke out in Spain, Portugal, Naples, and Sardinia, brought about by army officers belonging to secret societies, either Free Masons or *Carbonari*. They had the same program, the Spanish Constitution of 1812, copied from the French Constitution of 1791. In France the assassination of the Duc de Berri and a series of military plots, added to the outbreaks in the other countries, seemed to justify Metternich's warnings and predictions. The Tsar, convinced of the dangers of the Revolution, was converted to Metternich's principle of *intervention*. To restore order in the countries disturbed by the Revolution, the governments of the great powers held congresses, all in Austrian territory, at Troppau in Silesia in 1820, Laybach in Carniola in 1821, and Verona in Venetia in 1823.

Alexander himself proposed that the five Allies should interfere to check the Spanish revolution; the English government refused, fearing to offend the Spanish nation. But the revolution of Naples interested Austria directly, as her Italian subjects in Lombardy were conspiring with the Liberals. She prepared troops and announced that the Emperor was going to fulfil his duty as "natural guardian and protector of public tranquillity in Italy." The French government, unwilling to let Austria set herself up as the sovereign power in Italy, suggested collective intervention to the other states, in order to reassure the Italians, who were alarmed by the entry of an Austrian army. The Tsar agreed, and it was decided to hold a congress of the five great powers.

The Congress of Troppau was devoted to Neapolitan affairs. Metternich proposed intervention to restore the absolutist system that Ferdinand, by an agreement with Austria in 1815 (see p. 316), had promised not to change. The Tsar and France wished to begin by negotiating with the King of Naples to remove the revolutionary features of the constitution without suppressing it. England refused to hear of intervention; the powers, in her view, were to guarantee only the territorial balance of power among the states of Europe; they were not to interfere in their domestic policy. Thus the two opposing principles were formulated: *intervention* by Austria, the most absolutist power in Europe at

this time; *non-intervention* by England, the most liberal power. This did not, however, prevent England and Austria from being natural allies against Russia. *Intervention* became henceforth a part of the absolutist program, *non-intervention* of the liberal program. (The latter was condemned by the Syllabus; see p. 701.)

England and France refused to sign a collective declaration. But Metternich persuaded Alexander to it by showing him revolution threatening everywhere—in Portugal, in the Diet of Warsaw, in a riot of the Imperial Guard at Petersburg.* The three eastern powers, Austria, Russia, and Prussia, signed a declaration of principle. Every state of the European Alliance suffering an internal revolution thereby ceased to be a member of the Alliance and remained excluded “until its government should offer guarantees for legitimate order.” The powers agreed to refuse to recognise illegal reforms and to bring into “the bosom of the Alliance” those states in which such changes should be made. They reserved the right to employ first friendly overtures, then, if necessary, measures of constraint. Thus was the *principle of intervention* officially recognised in European public law. The Allies declared themselves at one in the struggle against revolution and ready to maintain by force their work of 1814, not only their territorial arrangements, but the political restoration of the absolutist system. This they were to do, not only against the will of the people, but even if need be against the

* He sent him a doctrinal exposition on the causes of revolution, summing them up “in a single word, *presumption*. . . Religion, morals, legislation, political economy, administration, all seem to have become a common good and accessible to all.” . . He denounces “the idea of emancipation of the peoples as absurd in itself.” The evil arose from the governments of the eighteenth century who had permitted irreligious writings and “talk of social compacts,” then from the Hundred Days and “the utterly wrong course of the French government from 1815 to 1820.” “It is the middle classes that have been seized by this moral gangrene. . . The people doubt the movement . . . the interested classes are the capitalists . . . state officials, literary men, lawyers, and the persons in charge of public education. . . Their war-cry, *Constitution* . . means change and trouble.” “It is not in the midst of the agitation of passions that we should think of *reform*. Wisdom teaches us at such times to confine our efforts to *preservation*.” The same elements of destruction have existed from the beginning of time; there have always been “immoral ambitious men, hypocrites, fanatics, evil spirits, and makers of plans.” But what gives them power in our time is “the liberty of the press, a plague unknown to the world until the last half of the eighteenth century.”

will of the governments. They constituted themselves a political supreme court for Europe, directing an international police against revolution. The two constitutional monarchies of the West, England and France, kept out of this demonstration, but in a passive attitude, leaving the field clear for the absolutist monarchies of the East.

This triumph for Metternich was announced to the world in the form of a despatch from the Russian government to its ambassador at Naples. "The Neapolitan revolution presents in itself too alarming a character to be ignored by the sovereigns. . . They have recognised this same spirit of trouble and disorder which will shortly lay waste the whole world. . . The sovereigns at once decided to admit the legality of nothing that was established in the Kingdom of Naples by revolution and usurpation."

Accordingly the sovereigns, refusing to negotiate with a revolutionary government, invited the King of Naples to come *in person*, to make terms with them at Laybach, where the congress was now sitting. They also summoned the other princes of Italy.

The Congress of Laybach¹⁸²¹ regulated the domestic arrangements of the Kingdom of Naples; King Ferdinand, who had left Naples swearing to defend the constitution, asked the congress to restore the absolutist system. The great powers decided among themselves to send an Austrian army if the King's subjects did not submit; they then communicated their decision to the envoys of the Italian governments. France made a useless demand to begin with conciliatory measures. Austria, acting in the name of the sovereigns, sent an army into the Kingdom of Naples. The length of the occupation was to be settled by a new congress.

The Congress of Laybach ended in a public declaration from Austria regarding the uniformity of views and principles of the great powers. The French government corrected it in an explanatory note, which Metternich seized upon to represent France to the Tsar as a hotbed of revolution. The sovereigns were about to leave Laybach, where they had been awaiting the result of the Austrian expedition into Naples, when they learned of the revolution of Piedmont (see p. 331). This was immediately followed by the Greek revolt of Ypsilanti in Moldavia (see p. 619). Alexander, without hesitation, gave his judgment against the revolutionists. He offered an army against Piedmont and dis-

owned Ypsilanti, whose name he caused to be struck off the rolls of the Russian army.

The Austrian army which had been sent into the Kingdom of Naples reduced it almost without fighting, in March, 1821. In Piedmont, an Austrian army, joined to the faithful Sardinian regiments, scattered the insurgent regiments at Novara (see p. 332). Ypsilanti's band was crushed by the Turks. Metternich took advantage of Alexander's irritation to excite him against revolution and against France.* He again issued a public declaration regarding "the vast conspiracy," the "impious league" organized "to overthrow existing institutions." He spoke also of "the barrier" that the sovereigns oppose to "this torrent." The Eastern question was then reopened by the Greek insurrections and massacres (see p. 619). The Tsar, traditional protector of Orthodox believers, protested by an ultimatum in June, 1821. "Christianity," he said, "could not remain a passive spectator of the extermination of a Christian people." But in the face of Austrian and English resistance, he finally accepted their mediation, designed to give the Sultan time to crush the Christian insurgents. Metternich had paralyzed Alexander.

The Spanish question was still to be settled. This was the work of the Congress of Verona¹⁸²² (October to December, 1822)—a meeting of the three sovereigns of the East, and envoys from the great powers and from the princes of Italy. The King of Spain had written personally to Louis XVIII. asking aid against his subjects. The French government did not wish to interfere, remembering the Spanish national war against Napoleon. The English government declared intervention dangerous, and refused to take part in it. But Alexander wanted war, "war against Spain, by France, with France, without France, or against France." The powers, with the exception of England, agreed to send a despatch to the Spanish government announcing Eu-

* He sent him another memorial in May, 1821: "A vast and dangerous conspiracy has since 1814 gained enough power and means of action to have obtained possession of many posts in public administrations . . . one word suffices to bring it into public favour . . . the word *Constitution*. . . Influence, position, fortune, all that human passions can covet, hang . . . from the tree of liberty, as from a greased pole." . . He recommends an agreement between Russia and Austria which shall impose on their representatives the obligation of mutual support on every occasion. . . "The factionists of every nation . . . have established a centre of information and influence (at Paris). . . We must establish another in opposition" (Vienna).

ropean intervention. The French government still hesitated for some time. But the French Chamber wanted war as a legitimist demonstration. France therefore made war to restore the authority of the King of Spain. It was nothing more than a military promenade, ending with the Siege of Cadiz (see p. 294).

English Policy under Canning.—Until now the alliance of the five powers had been officially maintained. England refused to intervene with her allies, but did not intervene against them. The alliance began to break up over two questions which had been left unsettled in 1815, the question of the Spanish colonies and the Eastern question.

A change in English policy came from a change in the office of foreign minister. Castlereagh having committed suicide in 1822, his successor, Canning, began by protesting at Verona against the Spanish intervention. Abandoning the passive attitude, he interfered actively in opposition to the Allies. His policy was the opposite of Metternich's. Not only did he, like his English predecessors, reject the principle of intervention in domestic questions, saying that the guarantee promised to the sovereigns by the treaties of 1815 was "territorial, not political," and did not bind the powers to maintain the internal system against revolutions; he went further, and claimed the right to *prevent* the intervention of another power in domestic questions.

The insurgent Spanish colonies had organized as independent states. At the Congress of Verona, Chateaubriand, envoy from France, proposed to extend the principle of intervention to colonies, and help the King of Spain to subdue them. Canning replied at first with a Parliamentary speech on the independence of peoples and national honour. He then officially recognised the Spanish republics, January, 1825. In answer to the French expedition to Spain, he interfered in Portugal, sending, late in 1826, a squadron, then an English army corps, against Don Miguel.

This was the first breach in the Metternich system.

Intervention in the East (1823-29).—The Eastern question had been before the world since 1823. Public opinion in Europe was very favourable to the Greek insurgents, but the governments kept out of the movement. The Congress of Verona refused even to receive the Greek envoys, and censured the revolt. Canning took the initiative by recognising the Greeks as belligerents in February, 1823. Alexander, in whom the Greeks had hoped and whose friends urged him to war, decided to take decisive part neither for the revolutionary Greeks nor for the Sultan,

the enemy of Christians. He called a conference at St. Petersburg to restore peace, and proposed a compromise: Greece to be divided into three self-governing principalities. This was unanimously rejected. The conference confined itself to inviting the Sultan, in April, 1825, to accept the mediation of the powers, but without threatening to impose peace on him.

Alexander was about to make a final decision, when he died, December, 1825. His death hastened the sudden change in Russian policy. Nicholas, his successor, refused to leave England the monopoly in protecting the Greeks; he had before his accession expressed sympathy for the Greek insurgents. Canning, taking advantage of these tendencies, sent Wellington to make terms with Nicholas; they agreed in April, 1826, that England should offer her mediation to the Sultan and that Russia should support her. This was an abandonment of Metternich's policy.

Russia had begun negotiations with the Turkish government on other questions, and was awaiting their termination to bring up the Grecian question. It was only at the end of a year, April, 1827, that the Grand Vizier received official communication of the Anglo-Russian protocol of 1826. He refused to consider it. But England and Russia held to their decision. France had already adhered to the protocol; the other powers, in July, 1827, declared their readiness to impose Grecian autonomy by force, and sent a fleet into Greece. They demanded from the Sultan an armistice for the Greeks, threatening in case of a refusal to take active measures (August). Thus the situation was the reverse of that of 1820: England and France were intervening, but in support of a revolution, while Austria and Prussia refused to intervene; Russia in 1820 intervened against the subjects, in 1827 against the sovereign.

The unexpected death of Canning in August changed the policy of the English ministry; his successors wished to avoid all complications. But the three powers found themselves already entangled. Their fleet, commanded by the English admiral, had come to the western coast of Morea to impose a truce on the two parties. Ibrahim at first accepted; then, on an order from the Sultan, began to devastate Messenia. The European fleet interfered, calling on the Egyptian fleet to depart. As in Ibrahim's absence his men refused to move, the allied fleet took a position in the harbor of Navarino by the side of the Egyptian ships. The Christian sailors were so excited against the Mussulmans

that a shot from an Egyptian vessel was enough to produce the battle of Navarino and the destruction of the Egyptian fleet (October 20). After this the Europeans withdrew. The Sultan demanded a disavowal and an indemnity, which were refused. Then, in December, he broke off relations with the three powers. The intervention finally led to a rupture with the Ottoman Empire.

Even the rupture did not, however, produce a general war. England simply sent a fleet in August, 1828, which decided Mehemet-Ali to recall Ibrahim. France sent an expedition into Morea in the same year. Russia alone entered upon war (February, 1828).

The war included two campaigns. That of 1828 was simply a march of Russians across Roumania, followed by the siege of fortresses; the Russian army, ill supplied and badly led, was stopped before reaching the Balkans, by the intrenched camp of Shumla.

The campaign of 1829 was decided by a single battle in Bulgaria. The Ottoman army, disorganized since the destruction of the janissaries, fell to pieces. Diebitsch profited by this to cross the Balkans and come down to Adrianople. He had with him only about 20,000 men, some of whom were disabled, and was too weak to take Constantinople. But the Sultan, intimidated by Diebitsch's decided attitude, imagined himself at the mercy of the Russians and accepted all their terms: war indemnity, destruction of the Turkish fortresses in Roumania, free passage of the straits to ships of all nations, and creation of the Kingdom of Greece (September, 1829). The peace of Adrianople (see p. 620) established Russia's predominance in the east.

Breaking up of the European Alliance (1830).—The Metternich system was shaken by Canning's policy and the Tsar's war in Turkey. But hitherto the powers had conflicted with Austria only on questions and in countries outside of the settlements of 1815. The treaties of 1815 were still intact.

The revolution of 1830 in France was the first breach in the work of the Congress of Vienna. It took away the legitimate government from the Bourbons, to whom the Allies had guaranteed it, and gave it to a revolutionary government under Louis Philippe, "King of the barricades." The new government was established in the name of the sovereignty of the people, the doctrine of the Revolution, with the tricolour flag, the emblem of the Revolution.

Then came the Belgian revolution, which cut in two the Kingdom of the Netherlands, the work of the Allies. Finally in England the Tories, allied with the absolutist monarchies against France, gave place in November, 1830, to the Whigs, allied with the European liberals. The Alliance of 1815 was definitively broken up; the Metternich system was abandoned.

BIBLIOGRAPHY.

FOR INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS, 1814-1896 (chapters xxv. to xxviii.).

BIBLIOGRAPHY.—**Waitz**, "Quellenkunde der Deutschen Geschichte," edit. of 1894; **Krones**, "Grundriss der österr. Gesch.," 1882, may serve as bibliog. for the external history. (For recent publications see **Ch.-V. Langlois**, "Manuel de Bibliog. Hist.," 1896, §§ 161, 163, 183, 184).—For the technical history of the wars, the "Catalogue de la Bibliothèque du Dépôt de la Guerre," vol. iii., 1885, constitutes practically a handier bibliog. than **J. Pohler**, "Bibliotheca His.-Mil.," 3 vols., 1887-95 (in course of publication), a universal catalogue.

DOCUMENTS.—The diplomatic documents are collected in **Martens**, "Recueil des Traités, Nouveaux Suppléments," 3 vols., 1839-42, "Nouveau Recueil" in two series (see **Waitz**, "Quellenk.," Nos. 688 and 6078). From 1861 it is best to resort to the periodic publication "Das Staatsarchiv." (see preface).

The chief official documents and story of events are in the annuals (see preface) and the series published under two different titles: "Die Gegenwart," 12 vols., 1848-56; "Unsere Zeit," since 1857.

The English "Foreign and State papers," pub. annually since 1814, contain valuable documents for all the countries.

WORKS.—**COMPLETE HISTORIES.**—**C. Bulle**, "Gesch. der Neuesten Zeit," 4 vols., 1886 (see preface).—**G. Weber**, ("Allgemeine Weltgesch."), "Gesch. des XIX^{ten} Jahrhunderts," 2 vols. 1879-80, semi-scientific popular edit.—**Flathe**, "Die Neueste Zeit," 3 vols., 1888-91 ("Allgem. Weltgesch.") In French there are only academic manuals.

The **Oncken** coll., "Allgem. Gesch. in Einzeldarstellungen," historical series of periods (see preface) is still the most scientific work.

For the diplomatic history, **Debidour**, "Hist. Diplom. de l'Europe," 1814-78, 2 vols., 1891, gives an account and bibliographies.

ON THE PERIOD 1815-30.

DOCUMENTS.—For Metternich's policy, **Metternich**, "Papiers," 8 vols., 1880-84 (letters and acts), principal collection; **F. Gentz**, Metternich's agent, a number of letters or memoirs (given in detail in **Waitz**, "Quellenkunde," No. 5799).—For Russian policy, **Pozzo di Borgo**, "Correspondance Diplomatique," 1890.—For English policy, **Castlereagh**, "Memoirs and Correspondence," 12 vols., in three series, 1848-49, 1851, 1853; **Stapleton**, "Canning and His Times," 1835.—For French policy, in addition to the

memoirs of **Villele**, **Pasquier**, **Vitrolles**, **Hyde de Neuville** mentioned in the bibliog. to chap. v.; **de Serre**, "Correspondance," 6 vols., 1876-77; **L. de Crousaz-Crétet**, "Le Duc de Richelieu . . .," 1897, extracts from the archives of foreign affairs.

WORKS.—**COMPLETE HISTORIES**: **Stern**, "Gesch. Europas," vol. i., 1894, is the most reliable guide, but stops at 1820.—**Gervinus**, "Gesch. des XIX^{ten} Jahrhunderts," 1855-66, French edit. "Hist. du XIX^e Siècle," 22 vols., 1864-74, stops at 1830, much detail, not always reliable.—**Flathe**, "Das Zeitalter der Restauration und der Revolution," 1883 (Oncken coll.), fairly intelligent, few references.

The most detailed accounts of this period are found in the national histories, mentioned for each country: **Treitschke** (Germany), **Springer** (Austria), **Bernhardy** (Russia), particularly important for European policy, **Viel-Castel** (France), the leading French history for foreign policy, **Spencer Walpole** (England), **Reuchlin** (Italy), **Baumgarten** (Spain), **Hertzberg** and **Mendelssohn** (Greece), **Rosen** (Turkey).—**Pauli**, "Gesch. Englands," 2 vols., 1864-67 ("Staatengesch. d. n. Zeit" coll.), which I have thought best not to cite for England's domestic history, is useful for her foreign relations.

EPISODES.—**E. Mühlenbeck**, "Étude sur les Origines de la Sainte-Alliance," 1888.—**A. Hugo**, "Hist. de la Guerre en Espagne en 1823," 2 vols., 1824-25.—**Prokesch-Osten**, "Gesch. des Abfalls der Griechen . . .," 6 vols., 1867, Grecian war.—**Von Moltke**, "Campagnes des Russes en Turquie d'Europe, 1828-29," trans. from the German., 2 vols. 1854 (orig. edit. 1845).

CHAPTER XXVI.

RIVALRY BETWEEN RUSSIA AND ENGLAND, 1830-54.

Conditions of Foreign Policy after 1830.—The Revolution of 1830 in France and the Whigs' accession to power in England transformed the political situation of Europe. The two great states of the West became parliamentary countries controlled by liberal parties; they broke the alliance with the three states that were still faithful to the principles of the Restoration. Europe was cut into two parts: the East, still absolutist, and the West, now become liberal.

In the absolutist monarchies of the East, the direction remained concentrated in the person of the sovereign or his ministers. The masters of policy were: in Austria, Metternich, governing in the name of the Emperor (Francis, then Ferdinand from 1835 to 1848); after the revolution of '48, Prince Schwarzenberg;—in Russia, Tsar Nicholas, autocrat and soldier, who himself directed diplomacy;—in Prussia, King Frederick William III., timid and peace-loving, and after 1840 Frederick William IV., full of fancies, but, except for one moment from 1849 to 1850, without a personal policy. Metternich, growing old and discouraged, with no personal influence over Nicholas, without means of action, for he knew the Austrian army to be disorganized, ceased to control diplomacy. The influence passed into the hands of the Tsar, the master of a victorious army; Nicholas was from 1830 to 1854 the representative of absolutism, the adversary of revolution and of France.

In the parliamentary monarchies of the West the ministers no longer decided foreign policy alone: they had to reckon with the Chambers and the opinion of the people. In France Louis Philippe, desirous of consolidating his throne and providing for his children, had personally a peaceful policy; but, as a parliamentary King, he had to appear to leave the government to his ministers. He evaded the difficulty by taking ministers from those who advocated his policy (Casimir-Perier, Broglie, and Guizot), or without policy (Molé and Soult), or when he was

obliged to submit to ministers of the Left (Laffitte and Thiers), by hindering their influence. In fact, France's policy was that of Louis Philippe, a policy of peace and inactivity, interspersed with belligerent demonstrations to satisfy national self-respect.

In England the sovereigns, William and later Victoria, left to the ministry even the direction of foreign affairs; English policy therefore depended on the ministerial party and varied with the changes of majority. The Conservative party maintained its policy of peace and abstention, but it was in power only for short intervals (1834-35, 1841-46, 1852). The Liberal or Whig party thus determined England's attitude, and this party left the direction of foreign policy almost entirely to Lord Palmerston, the minister of foreign affairs. Palmerston posed as the champion at once of English national honour and the liberal system; his policy was to intimidate the great powers by display of troops, threats of wars, and secret negotiation with liberal malcontents of every country to excite them against their governments. For more than thirty years (he died in 1865) he succeeded in hiding England's military weakness, and made her the rival of Russia as a controlling power. Europe from 1830 to 1854 was dominated by the rivalry between Nicholas and Palmerston, symbols of the absolutist East and the liberal West.

Under these official heads of Europe an accessory rôle in European diplomacy was played by a new sovereign family, that of Saxe-Coburg. Leopold, having become King of the Belgians and then son-in-law of the King of France, arranged a marriage for one of his nephews, Ferdinand, with the Queen of Portugal in 1836, and for another, Albert, with the Queen of England in 1840; the relations of the Coburg family with the reigning houses permitted them at times to act as mediators between the courts of the great states.

European policy became more complicated and more unstable than at the time of the Restoration. This was a period of active and intricate plots, revolutions, and demonstrations, which filled the newspapers, aroused violent feeling, and in the end accomplished but little.

Foreign policy was expressed by certain official formulæ. *Maintenance of treaties* was the preservation of the territorial arrangements of 1815. *Intervention* signified for the great powers the right to interfere in the internal affairs of secondary states in order to maintain the system established in 1815. When they interfered in the opposite direction, it produced a struggle for

influence, unless it resulted in a conference to restore the *European concert*. The *European balance of power*, an old formula of the old *régime*, was the endeavour to keep any of the five great powers from extending its dominion, especially in the Ottoman Empire, which was outside of the treaties of 1815.

Every internal complication in each country was for the great powers a temptation to interfere and extend their influence and an occasion for debating the question whether it was necessary to interfere for the support of the treaties or of the balance of power.

Recognition of the July Monarchy (1830).—The revolution of 1830 was a violation of the treaties of 1815; by driving from France the Bourbons, whose dynasty the powers had guaranteed, it opened up the *casus belli* foreseen by the convention of 1818 (see p. 751), it therefore presented the question of intervention in France against the revolution.

But the Allies did not feel strong enough to interfere; Louis Philippe represented to them that he had accepted the throne only to stop the revolution, that his presence alone guaranteed France against a republic, and assured the maintenance of the treaties of 1815. England, where the Tory ministry was held in check by a strong Whig minority, refused to interfere; she ordered her ambassador to remain in Paris, then recognised the government of Louis Philippe.* Metternich did not even ask the execution of the convention of 1818; no power had its army ready to march. The Tsar alone wished to crush the Revolution; he ordered his Russian subjects to leave France, forbade the tricolour flag in Russian ports, and sent agents to the Austrian and Prussian courts, urging them to war. But the other governments having recognised the usurper, he did the same. He contented himself with showing his contempt by refusing to call him "my brother," as the other sovereigns did.

The revolutionary monarchy of France, in spite of the treaties of 1815, joined the European concert. But "the King of the barricades" remained an intruder to the other sovereigns; Louis Philippe felt himself always regarded in Europe as an upstart, and the desire to put an end to this partial "boycott" was one of the constant features of his policy.

Settlement of Belgium (1830-32).—The Belgian revolution

* There is, so far as I know, no reason for supposing that the Wellington ministry had any thought of interfering in the domestic affairs of France.
—S. M. M.

was a second breach in the treaties of 1815. King William asked the great powers to restore him in possession of the territories guaranteed him in 1814. England called a conference at London to try and save the kingdom by persuading the Belgians to be content with a separate administration. The King of Prussia, William's brother-in-law, assembled an army on the Dutch frontier. The Tsar offered 60,000 men, and his envoy Diebitsch remained two months in Berlin to urge the King to war.

But the French government, urged by the party of action (see p. 134), took the part of the Belgians. The idea was to satisfy national self-respect by destroying even in a secondary matter, the treaties of 1815, setting up the principle of non-intervention and thereby securing the demolition of the Belgian fortresses erected against France, or even the cession of a bit of territory. France stopped Prussia by declaring that, if a Prussian army should enter from the east, a French army should enter from the west. The Tsar, on the point of interfering, was hindered by the Polish revolution (see p. 587).

When the London Conference opened, the Tory ministry had been replaced by a Whig ministry. Palmerston had the direction of foreign affairs and adopted the policy of an understanding between the two liberal powers, France and England. He agreed with Talleyrand, France's representative, to set up the principle of the absolute separation of Belgium. The envoys from the Eastern powers, having no precise instructions, yielded. The Conference imposed a truce on the two parties, then recognised the independence of Belgium, in December, 1830.

The Conference had to determine the territory of the new kingdom, the division of the debt between the two states, and the choice of the Belgian king. Talleyrand demanded for France an annexation of territory, Luxemburg or at least Philippeville and Marienburg, in order to satisfy French national pride; Palmerston, out of English national pride, refused.* It was agreed to give the throne to no prince of any of the five great powers.

The conference adopted three arrangements in succession:

1. January 20, 1831, the *bases of the separation*: the whole of Luxemburg to be given over to the King of Holland, about half of the total debt to Belgium. The King of Holland agreed; the Belgian Congress refused and elected as King a son of Louis

*Palmerston wrote: The French government constantly says to us: 'This or that must be done to satisfy public opinion in France,' but it should consider that public opinion exists in England as well as in France."

Philippe. Palmerston threatened France with war if he should accept; Louis Philippe, in spite of his ministry of actionists, decided on a refusal. The kingdom was then offered to Leopold of Coburg, who exacted, before accepting, a mitigation of the conditions of January 20.

2. June 26, 1831, *the 18 articles*: the *status quo* in Luxemburg, the debt contracted before 1816 to be assigned to Holland. Belgium accepted; and now it was Holland that refused and sent an army into Belgium. Leopold asked help from France; the French army entered to carry out the decisions of the conference. Palmerston, disturbed at seeing the French in Belgium, demanded evacuation and arranged a truce; but the French army remained until the Conference should have arranged for the demolition of the fortresses erected against France.

3. October 15, 1831, *the 24 articles*: restitution to Holland of a portion of Luxemburg and Limburg; Belgium made no objection, but the King of Holland persisted in his refusal. The Conference concluded the definite treaty. The great powers recognised the Kingdom of Belgium as a neutral state in 1832. The fortress of Antwerp had now to be taken from the Dutch. The two Western states agreed to employ force, against the wish of the other powers.

The Polish Question (1830-32).—The Polish insurgents against the Tsar asked help from the Western powers. The liberal parties supported them out of hatred for Nicholas; the opinion of all educated Europe showed itself strongly in their favour. The Laffitte ministry attempted to urge the Sultan to war. The Casimir-Perier ministry proposed to England a joint mediation. But neither France nor England had any means of action against a Russian army in Poland, and Palmerston refused to take part in a proceeding without practical effect. Poland therefore received only demonstrations of sympathy; the French Chamber voted in the address to the King a phrase expressing the conviction "that the Polish race would not perish."

The Eastern powers divided. Austria declared herself neutral, and was rather favourable to the Poles, although insurgents; Prussia, which hated Poland, aided the Russian army with supplies.

The Polish war, reduced to a struggle between the Polish and Russian armies, ended in the crushing of the Polish nation. Palmerston, by virtue of the treaties of 1815, claimed the maintenance of the privileges assured to the Poles. Russia replied that

the Treaty of Vienna imposed on her no conditions of internal government; the Constitution of 1815, having been only a spontaneous act of the Tsar, was annulled by the fact of the rebellion.

In France the taking of Warsaw was a national grief; in Paris, business was suspended, the theatres closed, and the declaration from the minister of foreign affairs, "order reigns in Warsaw," was regarded as an insult (1832).

Intervention of Austria and France in Italy (1831-32).—In Italy the revolution in the central states, the States of the Church, Modena, and Parma, had resulted in the creation of provisional governments. The dispossessed sovereigns asked aid from Austria. In France the "party of action" urged the support of the liberal insurgents against Austria's *protégés*. The Laffitte ministry declared that the Austrians would be allowed to occupy Parma, but not the States of the Church. The Austrian army from Lombardy occupied all the insurgent countries in March, 1831. The Casimir-Perier ministry offered no resistance, and contented itself, after the submission of the Italians, with demanding the retreat of the Austrian army. To satisfy French national pride, it declared its intention to occupy a portion of the States of the Church if the Austrians did not evacuate before the opening of the Chambers.

The Austrian army, having accomplished its work, withdrew from the States of the Church. But when, in January, 1832, it returned at the Pope's call, the French government found itself obliged to carry out its threat. It sent three ships with 1200 men to occupy the citadel of Ancona. Austria took advantage of this to leave her troops in the States of the Church until 1838.

Intervention in Spain and Portugal (1833-36).—In Spain and Portugal intervention began with a question of succession disputed between a minor queen supported by the Liberals, Isabella in Spain, Maria in Portugal, and a pretender supported by the absolutists, Carlos in Spain, Miguel in Portugal. The two parliamentary states of the West recognised the two queens, while the three absolutist monarchies of the East, while not officially recognising the two absolutist pretenders, yet gave them their support.

The liberal ministry in Spain asked aid from England. Palmerston advised the governments of the two queens to make an alliance with each other and with England; Talleyrand secured the entrance of France into the combination, and in April, 1834, the Quadruple Alliance was concluded. The powers undertook

to expel both pretenders from Portugal, England with her fleet, Spain with her army; the participation of France would be regulated later, if there was need of it. The treaty stipulated no intervention in Spain; Palmerston had not wished to furnish France this opportunity to gain a foothold in the peninsula.

Palmerston presented the Quadruple Alliance as a league of the four constitutional monarchies of the West which counterbalanced the league of the three absolutist monarchies of the East. It was more a demonstration than an effective act. It had almost no result except in Portugal.

The Eastern Question (1832-33).—The Tsar, since the treaty of 1829, had kept the Ottoman Empire under his influence. France supported Mehemet-Ali, the Egyptian pasha: in popular opinion he was regarded in France as the future regenerator of the Ottoman Empire and the faithful ally of the French.

Palmerston declared the integrity of the Ottoman Empire indispensable to English interests; it was to him a dogma which was not to be discussed. He distrusted Mehemet-Ali, attributing to him a project for creating an Arabian kingdom. Ibrahim's expedition into Syria, followed by the march of the Egyptian army into Asia Minor, made a vivid impression on public opinion in 1832. The Sultan, having failed to secure aid from the maritime states, appealed to Russia, which sent troops in April, 1833.

France and England, by frightening the Sultan, succeeded in making him accept Mehemet-Ali's conditions. Russia made no objection, but used the Sultan's irritation to secure the treaty of alliance of Unkiar-Skelessi in July, 1833 (see p. 622).

England and France were informed of this, but could not arrange to co-operate against Russia.

The Refugees and the Alliance of the Absolutist Monarchies (1833).—The three Eastern powers, Russia, Austria, and Prussia, discontented with the intervention of the Western states in Belgium, Spain, and Portugal, disturbed by the agitations of German, Polish, and Italian revolutionists, who had taken refuge in Switzerland and France, arranged together for a demonstration against revolution. This was the Münchengraetz interview of September, 1833, between the Emperor of Austria, the Tsar, and the Crown Prince of Prussia. A manifesto was drawn up, but the King of Prussia refused to sign it for fear of being entangled in a war, and they had to be content with the secret treaty of Berlin, October 15, 1833. The three sovereigns, "in consideration

of the dangers with which the order of things established in Europe by public law and treaties, especially those of 1815, continued to be threatened," declared themselves "unanimously resolved to consolidate the system of preservation which constitutes the immutable basis of their policy." Consequently they "recognised that every independent sovereign has the right to call to his aid, in the domestic troubles as in the external dangers of his country, such other independent sovereign as seems to him most fitted to assist him, and that the latter has the right to refuse such aid according to his interests or convenience. In case this aid should be granted, no power not invoked . . . by the threatened state has the right to interfere, either to prevent the assistance or to act in a contrary direction. In case the material assistance of one of the three courts should be called for and any power should wish to oppose it by armed force, the three courts should consider as directed against each of them any act of hostility undertaken with this end." This was an engagement to maintain the doctrine of *intervention* * formulated in 1820—an Eastern league opposed to that of the West.

After the death of Emperor Francis, the agreement between the three courts was renewed by two interviews in 1835 at Kalisch in Poland and at Teplitz. It was agreed to publish no manifesto. "What the three courts wish is generally known," wrote Metternich; "to repeat it is useless, and could have no other result than to weaken their strong position."

Rupture of the Alliance between France and England (1836-40).—The understanding established between France and England in 1830 broke up of itself, owing to the difference in interest of the governments.

1. Both were parliamentary governments of property holders, obliged to consider the passions of the middle class. Now, in both countries the recollection of the long wars between England and France was still vivid. The national heroes were, in England Wellington, the conqueror of Waterloo, in France Napoleon, the mortal enemy of England. In this time, when the army was composed entirely of poor men, the liberal middle class

* Metternich, as early as 1833, spoke contemptuously of the July Monarchy. "This throne has created nothing . . . all it can do is to maintain itself. Its only product is that of the so-called principle of non-intervention, . . . the only invention that has been made by the capital of propaganda, . . . a negative means of keeping other states in the nullity of action that its own position necessitates."

in France spoke freely of war and conquest, to destroy the odious treaties of 1815 and restore the "national boundaries," the Rhine and the Alps. The English Parliament loved to boast of England's glory, her domination on the seas and in Europe. English patriotism consisted in regarding *insular* affairs only as worthy of consideration and employing the word *continental* as a term of contempt. The difficulty increased when the great political questions which had absorbed the attention of all parties had been almost settled—in England after the reforms, in France after the strengthening of the monarchy. Domestic policy, which had become stagnant, ceased to arouse the public and fill the newspapers. Interest was centred on foreign affairs. The opposition, especially in France, finding at home no material with which to excite the middle class against the government, busied itself with foreign policy, in which it sought to exalt national pride. Between these two jealous and conceited nations there was continual rivalry and incessant coolness. The governments, for fear of dangerous unpopularity, had to be always ready to sustain "national honour," which practically meant to refuse all that the rival nation asked for. These sentiments were enough to make harmony difficult.

2. Louis Philippe wished to be accepted by the legitimate sovereigns and, by means of alliances with the old dynasties, introduce his family into monarchical society. He laboured personally to regain favour with the Eastern monarchs, who led the courts of Europe, and to free himself from the compromising union with the liberal ministries of England.

The coolness became apparent as early as 1836. In the countries where England and France had interfered together, Greece, Spain, and Portugal, each supported a party subject to its own influence and strove to excite it against the party of the other.

The discord was shown especially in Spain. Louis Philippe supported his kinswoman Christina and the moderate party. England sided with the *progressists*.

The Spanish government, threatened by the Carlists, asked help from the Quadruple Alliance in 1836. Louis Philippe promised it; but as the progressists had gained control of the government by a revolution, he broke with Thiers and remained neutral between Isabella and Don Carlos.

Louis Philippe made overtures to the Eastern powers. He wished to marry his eldest son, the Duke of Orleans, and sent him to visit the courts of Prussia and Austria. In Vienna the

Duke met with a cold reception; the Austrian nobility, being legitimist, ignored his presence. He asked for the hand of a daughter of the Archduke, but was refused. Louis Philippe was hurt, and resigned himself to the acceptance of a princess proposed by the King of Prussia, Helen of Mecklenburg, who became Duchess of Orleans.

The Eastern Question and the Straits Convention (1839-41).—The official rupture between France and England came on the Eastern question. All the great powers announced the intention of maintaining the integrity of the Ottoman Empire. France alone had not defined her policy; she hesitated between the Sultan, her traditional ally, and Mehemet-Ali, her *protégé*.

The question was little by little complicated by the personal intrigues of English representatives. Sultan Mahmoud, urged by Ponsonby, the English ambassador, wished to avenge the defeat of 1832, and in 1839 ordered his army to invade Syria; the Egyptian forces were at the frontiers.

England and France, once more working together, wanted to impose a truce on the two parties. But when the French envoy arrived at Constantinople to put a stop to hostilities, Ponsonby refused to assist, because he had received no instructions. The Turkish government concluded from this that England wanted war, and gave the order to march. The Ottoman army was put to rout (June, 1839); then the Ottoman admiral, going over to the winning party, led the fleet to join that of Mehemet-Ali (July). Mahmoud had just died; Khosrew, in the name of the new Sultan, Abdül-Medjid, offered to make peace. Mehemet refused to negotiate with him.

The Tsar had intervened by right of the treaty of 1833. To prevent his working alone, the other powers announced to the Sultan that they would take the question in hand, and engaged him to await the result of their course before making terms (July 24). But France and England disagreed on the terms to be imposed on Mehemet-Ali. Palmerston wanted to demand the restitution of the Turkish fleet, and proposed to demand it by an ultimatum; the French government refused to agree to this.

Palmerston, changing his tactics, entered into negotiation with the Eastern powers, first with Austria, offering to call upon Mehemet to return the fleet, and, if he refused, to blockade the coasts of Egypt and Syria; he added that if necessary England would act "with less than four powers." The Tsar, seizing the chance to isolate France, sent an offer of co-operation to England; he

renounced his separate treaty of 1833 with the Sultan, and declared himself ready to work in harmony with all his allies, but by preference without France (September).

Palmerston proposed the simultaneous entry of the three fleets, English, French, and Russian; the French government (Soult) agreed. But when the Chamber met, in January, 1840, the Soult ministry fell, and public opinion in France declared itself firmly opposed to any ultimatum to Mehemet-Ali.

Palmerston finally negotiated independently of France. The four other powers concluded with the Sultan the Treaty of London, July 15, 1840, which determined the ultimatum to be imposed on Mehemet-Ali: the Sultan offered him only hereditary Egypt and a part of Syria during his lifetime, and this on condition that he should accept within ten days; at the end of that time he would be driven back into Syria, and ten days later the Sultan would no longer be bound to anything. The powers agreed to fulfil these conditions by force.

As in 1815, France found herself alone against the four *allies*; their decision took the aspect of an ultimatum addressed to France over the head of Mehemet-Ali; the Eastern question became a question of national honour. The Chambers became wildly excited; people began to talk of renewing the struggle against Europe, of breaking down the treaties of 1815, even of regaining the Rhine frontier. This aroused a counter-movement in Germany (see p. 389). The Thiers ministry, which rested only on national feeling,* began to prepare armament, and Austria and Prussia concluded arrangements in the event of a war (November). But neither Louis Philippe nor the Chamber wanted war. Mehemet-Ali had rejected the ultimatum. France recalled her fleet to Toulon and left the powers a free field against him.

A combined English, Austrian, and Turkish fleet bombarded the Syrian ports; it destroyed in three hours St. Jean d'Acre, which was thought to be impregnable, and then went to blockade Alexandria. Mehemet, abandoned by France, yielded, in November, 1840. The allies then consented to annul the treaty of

* Before the break with England the French government had asked of Palmerston—who willingly granted it—permission to bring back to France the body of Napoleon I., which had been buried at St. Helena. The Prince of Joinville was sent to bring it; on his return, the Thiers ministry had fallen, and the transfer of Napoleon's ashes to the Invalides was simply an official ceremony.

London, and to replace it with a general treaty of all the powers with the Sultan,—the Straits Convention of July, 1841,—which declared the straits closed to all war vessels. But France's pride had received a wound for which the middle classes could not forgive England.

The "State of Good Feeling" (1841-45).—The succession of a Right Centre ministry in France (Guizot) and a Conservative ministry in England to the control of foreign affairs, both with a policy of peace and conciliation, led to a desire for a restoration of good feeling between the two governments. They tried to restore harmony between the two states. The sovereigns exchanged visits, Victoria in France at the Château d'Eu in 1843 and 1845, Louis Philippe in England in 1844; the ministries chatted together amicably, and all official utterances spoke of the friendly feeling between the two countries.

But the understanding was between the governments alone, and they had to contend with public opinion to avoid conflicts between the two nations. In France, the public mind was aroused against the *droit de visite*, or right of searching vessels engaged in the slave trade, and still more against the Pritchard indemnity (see p. 147). In England, the public protested against the tariff union between France, Belgium, and Switzerland, and the government declared that England regarded it as an attempt against the independence of Belgium: she could not permit French soldiers to work in Antwerp under the disguise of customs officials (1842). Public opinion was also aroused by the French war against Morocco.

It was then that Tsar Nicholas came to England (1844) to propose an arrangement with the Tory government for settling together the fate of the Ottoman Empire, whose end he believed to be near at hand. He disclaimed any desire to take any part of its territory, but could not allow any other power to seize it. The English ministers refused to discuss the question.

The Spanish Marriages (1846).—Queen Isabella of Spain and her younger sister Louisa were now of marriageable age; their mother wished to give their hands to French princes. Louis Philippe took this opportunity to provide for his son, the Duke of Montpensier. The two governments of France and England came to an agreement as to these marriages. They settled the principle in 1845 that Queen Isabella should marry a Bourbon, and that after she should have issue the Infanta Louisa might be married to the Duke of Montpensier. One of two cousins was to

marry the Queen: France proposed Francis of Assisi, England his brother Henry. Christina despised Francis, who was weak in both body and mind, and detested Henry, who had linked his name with the progressists. She would have preferred a European prince. The two governments arranged to urge her to a decision.

But Bresson and Bulwer, who represented France and England in Spain, were personal rivals and enemies, and laboured against each other. Bresson urged the Queen to marry both her daughters at once; Bulwer sought to prevent the Infanta's marriage, and to obtain Isabella's hand for a Prince of Coburg. Christina sent a message to the father of the Coburg prince, proposing the marriage (May, 1846). Guizot gave notice that if the candidature of the Bourbons were rejected, France would assert her right to act for Montpensier; Aberdeen censured Bulwer, and notified Guizot of the intrigue.

But the Tory ministry, to which Aberdeen belonged, fell in June, 1846. Palmerston took charge of English foreign policy and altered the position of the question; he declared England's willingness to allow a choice between three candidates—Isabella's two cousins and Coburg; but he added that the Spanish government was arbitrary and that its ministers must soon return to the constitution (July 19). Louis Philippe regarded the agreement of 1845 as broken. Bresson had already, without instructions, endeavoured to accomplish the simultaneous marriage of Isabella with Francis and the Infanta with Montpensier; instead of disowning him, France continued the negotiations. Christina, who was bitterly opposed to English influence, induced Isabella to accept Francis. The two marriages were announced and immediately celebrated. The English government represented the affair as a breach of faith, and declared the good understanding between England and France at an end.

The Cracow Affair (1846).—In 1815 the Allies had made the Polish province of Cracow an aristocratic republic governed by a Senate under Austrian supervision. The destruction of the Kingdom of Poland made Cracow the centre of the Polish nationalist movement; in 1831 a "Society of the Polish People" was founded there, branches of which were established in the Polish countries.

The revolutionary patriots decided to incite revolt in both Prussian and Austrian Poland at once. But the Prussian police arrested the leaders in the plot, and the insurrection was confined

to Galicia. The Cracovian Senate declared itself unable to answer for order, so Austria sent troops to its support. The patriots revolted, drove out the Austrians, and, in February, 1846, formed a provisional government which published a manifesto.

The Austrian army returned quickly with crushing force, and the three monarchies of the East made arrangements to suppress the Republic of Cracow. Metternich announced in November that it was annexed to Austria, explaining that as Cracow had put an end to her political life with her own hands, she had forfeited herself to the power to which she had belonged. England and France, having just fallen out on the Spanish marriages, merely protested in the name of the treaties of 1815.

The Portuguese and Italian Affairs (1847).—After the Spanish marriages Louis Philippe completed his evolution toward the autocratic monarchies of the East. The English government was isolated and began to work alone, on opposite lines from those followed by the other powers.

In Portugal, England interfered to end a civil war. The English Parliament passed a vote of censure against Palmerston for having violated the principle of non-intervention.

In Italy Palmerston intervened to encourage the liberal and nationalist movement and persuaded the princes to make reforms (see p. 338). Metternich, disturbed by a movement so palpably hostile to Austria, sent a note to the four great powers. He repeated his famous saying "Italy is a geographical expression," and asked if they desired to maintain the treaties of 1815, whereby Italy was divided into independent sovereign states. Palmerston replied that the sovereignty of the Italian princes guaranteed them the right to make reforms without outside hindrance; that the reforms were necessary to calm discontent. He urged Austria to use her influence to secure reforms in Naples. The Italian governments had the impression that only a pretext was wanting for Austria to make armed intervention; in October, 1847, Palmerston, informed of this impression, sent as special envoy Lord Minto, to assure the King of Sardinia of England's friendship; he brought about a treaty of customs union between the Pope, Tuscany, and Sardinia, and stopped the civil war in Sardinia by imposing a truce upon the King. The English government posed as protector of the Italians against absolutist Austria.

The Swiss Affair (1847-48).—The treaties of 1815 guaranteed the Constitution of Switzerland. The Radical party, in propos-

ing a revision, menaced the work of the Allies (see p. 268); it disturbed the monarchical governments by its democratic domestic policy. The King of Prussia wished to prevent the transformation of Switzerland into a federal republic, which would be irreconcilable with his rights as the Prince of Neufchâtel.

In 1845 Austria, Prussia, and France had agreed on the necessity of preventing revolution and supporting the *Sonderbund*; but they had been unable to agree on the means. Metternich proposed an armed intervention; Guizot a peaceful pressure, for fear "of wounding, in all the Swiss, conservative or radical, the feeling of national independence." Guizot wished to wait for war before interfering, and he desired joint action by all the powers guaranteeing the treaties, including England. He kept the French envoy from taking any hand in the contest. When the Diet prepared to vote the dissolution of the *Sonderbund*, Metternich proposed to send identical notes before the vote, in order to intimidate the deputies. Guizot refused this, and contented himself with making some suggestions regarding the nature of the Swiss union and the treaties of 1815. Palmerston took advantage of this to play off the four powers against each other. He did not refuse to intervene, but he delayed negotiations and secretly advised the Swiss Diet to work quickly. While the powers were drafting an identical note to impose peace, the Swiss government determined upon war, November 4. Palmerston again gained time by proposing a counter project, which the others refused; he, in his turn, refused that of Guizot, and the English agent in Switzerland sent word to General Dufour to finish the war as soon as possible. When the identical note arrived the war was over.

The canton of Neufchâtel, which had remained neutral, was condemned by the Diet to pay a fine; then it made its revolt, drove out the Prussian governor, and constituted itself as a republic, in 1848. The King of Prussia protested vigorously, asked the powers to intervene, and finally consented to leave the decision to a conference. The Revolution of 1848 interrupted the affair.

Revolutions of 1848.—Revolutions had begun in Switzerland as early as 1847, in Sicily in January, 1848. The French revolution was not the first, but by its example it incited a general movement of democratic and nationalist insurrections. The governments, as yet inexperienced in the art of repression, seized with a mystical fear of *revolution*, a mysterious and incalculable force,

lost heart and hardly resisted. Except in the extreme West (England, Spain, and Portugal), Sweden, Norway, and Russia, the movement was produced all over Europe. In Belgium, Holland, and Denmark it took the peaceful form of an electoral or constitutional reform. It was an internal revolution in France (February), in Austria and Prussia (March), in Germany, and in central Italy. It took the form of a nationalist movement, resulting in war, in northern Italy, Schleswig-Holstein, and Hungary.

The revolution upset all European politics by transforming the domestic condition of the three central powers. It suddenly withdrew France from the understanding with the autocratic monarchies and paralyzed Austria and Prussia. England and Russia alone retained their liberty of action, and used it to take the rôle of arbiters, but in directions opposed to each other.

At one time it was thought that the French Republic was to revive the tradition of the war of Republican propagandism. In Paris there was a demonstration in favour of intervention in Italy and Poland. The provisional government had determined on peace, and Lamartine announced it to Europe by an official declaration, March 5. But as the belligerent demonstrations continued (the insurrection of May 15 was made to demand intervention in Poland), the revolutionists of Europe continued to hope for aid from the French revolutionists, who might be brought into power by a new revolution.

Palmerston, content with the fall of Guizot, recognised the Republic; the other powers had no time to arrange to oppose him. Austria was occupied with a revolution in Vienna and in her Lombardo-Venetian Kingdom (March). For the first time, Sardinia, urged by the Italian nationalist movement, dared to attack Austria. After the revolt of Milan, the Sardinian army entered Lombardy without a declaration of war (April). The Austrian government, out of which Metternich had been driven, appealed to Palmerston to restrain his ally, Sardinia. Palmerston thus became arbiter between Austria and the Italian states.

When Austria had recovered her balance, Radetzky's army, which had remained intact in the barracks and was now re-enforced by 20,000 men, took the offensive, reoccupied Venetia, except Venice, in June, and then attacked the Sardinian army. A single battle, Custozza, July 25, settled the war; the Sardinian army fell back and left the whole of Lombardy to the Austrians.

Sardinia asked assistance from France and England, who agreed to offer their mediation; a truce was arranged, and a conference to be held at Brussels; but victorious Austria refused any cession of territory, and the negotiations hung in suspense. England also intervened to impose a truce on the King of Naples in his war with his subjects in Sicily (September, 1848).

In Germany the revolution brought about a national parliament which, in June, 1848, created an imperial government (see p. 392). But the new government was not recognised by England, which opposed the commercial unity of Germany, nor by France, which did not want commercial unity without a democratic constitution, nor by the Tsar, who abhorred all forms of revolution.

In the duchies of Schleswig-Holstein the revolution, at first purely local, established a German government and led to a national war between the Danes and the people of the duchies—the latter being supported by German volunteers, and later by Prussian troops. The Northern powers were inclined to support the Danes, England in order to prevent the creation of a German navy, the Tsar from hatred of revolution and because the King of Denmark was his kinsman. England, Russia, and Sweden organized the London Conference, which imposed a truce and a provisional solution (see p. 570).

The Restorations (1849).—Austria, the power most shaken by the revolution of '48, set the example of military reaction. Prince Schwarzenberg took charge of Austrian affairs and laboured to destroy the work of the revolutionists.

The restoration was begun by Austria in October, 1848; the King of Prussia followed the example in Prussia in December. The progress of reaction was interrupted by the Hungarian revolution and by the attempt to constitute a German Empire under the King of Prussia.

In Italy the republicans took advantage of this to establish a republic in central Italy, in February, 1849; Sardinia to renew hostilities. The Austrian army, however, attacked the Sardinian army, and the single combat of Novara (March, 1849) was sufficient to scatter it and force Sardinia to ask for peace. Austria demanded the suppression of the Italian republics; she herself undertook the management of Tuscany. For Rome the intervention was much slower; the Catholic states disputed as to who should undertake it. France took the task upon herself, in order to check Austria (see p. 345). But the majority in the French

Assembly wanted the restoration of the Pope, while the President desired to restore Rome only when reformed in lay matters and with the consent of the inhabitants. This discord showed itself in contradictory military operations. The French expedition announced on landing that it had come to prevent Austrian intervention and fraternized with the soldiers of the Roman Republic. It found Rome barred against it, however, and, after attempting a surprise, was driven back. Then came to the Pope's aid armies from Naples, Spain, and Austria; the Austrians occupied Romagna. The French agent, de Lesseps, arranged a compromise with the Romans on May 31, but the French government rejected it. The French army, with re-enforcements, finally besieged Rome and forced it to capitulate. The restoration was complete; President Louis Napoleon signified his dissatisfaction in a public letter.

In Germany the conflict between the democrats and the governments turned into insurrection. The King of Prussia accomplished the restoration by means of his armies in Baden and in Saxony; the Frankfort Parliament dispersed. The question of the duchies was revived at the expiration of the truce, but the King of Prussia had enough of this war, and undertook personal charge of the negotiations; the conference, transferred to Berlin, could not arrange a definite settlement and confined itself to a truce (see p. 570).

In Hungary, where the revolution had set up a republic, the restoration was accomplished by a regular war against the Hungarian army (see p. 419). Austria, threatened with a renewed invasion by the Hungarians, appealed to the Tsar; and it was a Russian army that conquered Hungary.

Nicholas had posed as a restorer of legitimate monarchy. Palmerston posed as protector of revolutionary patriots. Five thousand Hungarians had taken refuge in Turkey; Austria and Prussia insisted upon their extradition. Palmerston induced the Sultan to refuse this. The two Emperors threatened, and broke off their diplomatic relations with the Sultan, but in the end had to be content with the expulsion of the refugees from Turkey. The Sultan imprisoned about thirty of them, whose release Palmerston accomplished after two years' of negotiating. England also protested against the treatment of political prisoners in the Kingdom of Naples.

Austria's Triumph over Prussia (1850).—Austria, busy with Italy and Hungary, had left the King of Prussia to work his will

in German affairs; he had put down the insurrections, organized the Union (see p. 397), and taken up the question of the duchies. But Austria and Russia were agreed to make the restoration complete by destroying Prussia's work.

The King of Prussia found himself divided by two contradictory sentiments: from German patriotism he supported the Germans in the duchies; from self-respect he held to the Union, since Austria wished to destroy it; but his respect for legitimacy kept him from interesting himself in subjects who revolted against their sovereign and in a constitution voted by a revolutionary parliament. He agreed to change the constitution of the Union, but by a conference between Prussia and Austria without interference from the Diet, which he regarded as dissolved. The Austrian government insisted on referring matters to the Diet; it did not wish to make war on Prussia single-handed, but was trying to draw Russia and the German states into it.

Schwarzenberg's policy, summed up in the famous epigram: "Humiliate Prussia, then destroy her," consisted in compromising the King of Prussia with the Tsar by compelling him to declare himself opposed to restoration. Nicholas, though displeased with the King of Prussia for having given a "democratic" constitution to his people, and also favorable to the King of Denmark, wished, nevertheless, to avert war between the two conservative monarchies of Germany. He promised his support to the one that remained faithful to the treaties of 1815.

The Berlin Conference failed to settle the question of the duchies. England and France * insisted that it should be settled. All the powers were inclined to return to the arrangements existing prior to 1848. The King of Prussia, in alarm, decided to desert the Germans in the duchies, and made the Treaty of Berlin, July 2. The conference was transferred to London. England, France, and Russia pledged themselves to maintain the integrity of the Danish monarchy, thus giving the question of the duchies a European interest. They later solved the problem of the succession (1852) by a permanent union of Denmark with the duchies.

Then Austria, approaching the question of the Union, asked the King of Prussia to declare null the Constitution of Erfurt. The King perceived that this constitution was impracticable, but

* Napoleon's attempts to profit by the disunion between Prussia and Austria, his sending of Persigny in 1849, and his conversation with the Prussian ambassador in 1850, had no practical effect.

he did not wish to abandon the principle. Schwarzenberg mobilized his forces, the Kings of Wurtemberg and Bavaria joined Austria against Prussia; the three sovereigns had an interview in October, in which a martial toast was drunk.

The Prussian government divided into two parties, one for peace, the other for mobilization. The King first let his ministry decide by majority for peace (Prince William was one of the minority); then, on learning that Austria was bringing troops into Bavaria, he ordered mobilization. The war was thought to be begun; there was even a skirmish. Then Schwarzenberg (November 5) demanded the withdrawal of the Prussian troops. The King obeyed; and, yielding on the question of the Union, he had it declared dissolved by his allies. He merely asked to be intrusted with the execution of the decisions of the Diet in Holstein and in Hesse (his object was to support the people of Hesse in maintaining their constitution). Austria refused, and the Tsar supported her.

The King of Prussia, isolated and distressed, again gave way; he asked an interview with Schwarzenberg. This was the famous Olmütz interview, November 28, 1850—the symbol of Prussia's humiliation. The Prussian envoy promised disarmament. Prussia obtained in return only the promise of a conference, which was held at Dresden in 1851, and led to nothing but certain exchanges of notes.

There remained nothing of Prussia's plans. Germany, having seen her publicly give way, long retained the impression that she had not the strength to resist Austria.

Recognition of the French Empire (1852).—The restoration of the monarchical system in France was welcomed by the great powers. The Tsar approved the *coup d'état*, though protesting beforehand against the title of emperor. Austria even accepted the title of emperor, "however injurious it may seem to the dignity of the old dynasties to yield an equal rank to an individual like Louis Napoleon." In England Palmerston approved the *coup d'état*; and it was the occasion of a conflict with his colleagues and the Queen, who reproached him with having acted contrary to the decisions adopted by the Cabinet. The King of Prussia, though ill disposed toward the usurper, followed the example of the other governments.

The proclamation of the Empire reopened the French question. The treaties of 1815 and 1818 excluded forever the Bonaparte family from the throne of France; the accession of a Na-

napoleon was, therefore, a *casus belli*. The numeral adopted by Napoleon (III.) aggravated the violation of the treaties by counting as a legitimate sovereign Napoleon II., who had never been recognised by the Allies. But the advantage of seeing France once more a monarchy decided the governments to accept the new empire; Napoleon III., like Louis Philippe, had formally assured them of his intention to maintain peace.

The four great powers contented themselves with announcing in December, 1852, that they would accept Napoleon's promises of peace and continue to maintain the *status quo*. After this the English government, followed by all the rest, recognised the Empire. But the Tsar would grant only the title "good friend," saying that the Russian court said "dear brother" only to those sovereigns whose claim rested on the same principle as that of the Tsar.

Napoleon, though recognised, was not admitted to equality with the princes of Europe. When he wanted to marry, no princely house, not even the Vasas, nor the Hohenzollern-Sigmaringen, was willing to give him a daughter. He decided, in 1853, to marry Eugénie de Montijo, belonging to an old family of the Spanish nobility.

The Tsar and the Eastern Question (1852-53).—Nicholas, having restored order in the East, wished to settle the Eastern question. He felt himself able to count on the docility of Austria and Prussia; he had only to come to an agreement with England. He had not wished to treat with Palmerston, the patron of revolutionists. But a coalition ministry, under Aberdeen, having succeeded to power in 1852, he renewed the proposition which he had made without success in 1844 to the Peel ministry, namely, that England and Russia should settle the Eastern question together. He told the English ambassador that "the sick man" (Turkey) was dying and that he believed the moment at hand to arrange with England for his burial; for his own part, he had decided to occupy Constantinople as a pledge, but not to keep it. He then offered Egypt and Crete to England.

The English government, as always before, supported the Ottoman Empire. The English ambassador to Constantinople, Stratford Canning, was personally hostile to Russia, and encouraged the Sultan to resist the Tsar. Since 1850 a conflict for the possession of the Holy Places had been raging between the Catholics, under French protection, and the Orthodox (or Greek Church) believers, under Russian protection (see p. 626). The

Turkish government, pressed by the two rival states, had tried to escape trouble by granting the demands of both (January, 1852); but the two grants were contradictory. France and Russia both demanded a solution, each in accordance with its own document; both threatened the Sultan with force.

The Tsar, under pretext of settling the question, sent a special envoy, Menschikoff, who arrived in Constantinople in April, 1853, with a grand escort and the airs of a master. The English ambassador knew that he had come to conclude a special treaty that should recognise the Tsar as the protector of Orthodox churches throughout the Turkish Empire. He therefore advised the Porte to decide the question of the Holy Places as Russia wished,—which was done,—and to reject the treaty for the guarantees of the Greek Church. Menschikoff then presented an ultimatum. The Sultan refused, and, in May, Menschikoff withdrew, severing diplomatic relations.

The Tsar was annoyed and wanted to declare war, but his ministry advised peace. As a compromise the Tsar accepted a halfway measure. He sent an army, in July, to occupy the Roumanian principalities, but without declaring war on the Sultan. This was a means of coercion that he had tried before. It now stirred up public opinion in England and displeased Austria. The governments of the great powers, not as yet disposed to war, arranged a note of conciliation. The Tsar accepted it, but Stratford Canning persuaded the Sultan to demand a change in terminology, which the Tsar refused (September).

At the Sultan's request the English and French fleets entered the Straits, contrary to the convention of 1841. Russia protested. England replied that Turkey, since the occupation of the principalities, was no longer at peace. The Sultan ordered the Turkish army to cross the Danube and declared war on the Tsar (November 4). The Eastern question was opened again; but the Sultan was not alone in the face of the Tsar. For the first time since 1815 the great powers were to make war. The European concert was definitely at an end.

BIBLIOGRAPHY.

For bibliography and complete histories see under chap. xxv.

DOCUMENTS.—For Austrian policy, **Metternich** (see bibliog. of chap. xxv).—For English policy, **L. Bulwer**, "The Life of Viscount Palmerston," 3 vols., 1871-74, Palmerston's letters, connected by historical text; **Malmesbury**, "Memoirs of an ex-Minister," 3 vols., 1885; **Loftus**, "Diplom.

Reminiscences, 1837-62," 2 vols., 1892; **Urquhart**, "The Portfolio," 6 vols., 1836, Fr. edit. 5 vols., 1837, anti-Russian policy.—For French policy, **Guizot**, "Mémoires," 8 vols., 1858-67.—For Prussian policy, **Ranke**, "Aus dem Briefwechsel Friedrich Wilhelms IV. mit Bunsen," 1873.—For the Coburg policy, **Stockmar**, "Denkwürdigkeiten," 1872, extracts from the papers of the Coburgs' confidant; **Th. Martin**, "Life of the Prince Consort," 5 vols., 1875-85, an authorized biography of Prince Albert.

WORKS.—**Flathe**, "Zeitalter der Restaur. u. d. Revol.," 1884 (Oncken coll., see bibliog. of chap. xxv.), is the only complete history.—The most important national histories for foreign policy are **Walpole** (England), **Hillebrand**, **Thureau-Dangin**, **Taxile Delord** (France); **Treitschke** (Germany); **Springer** (Austria); **Reuchlin** and **Bianchi** (Italy); **Baumgarten** (Spain); **Rosen** (Turkey); **Juste** (Belgium); **Henne am Rhyn** (Switzerland).

EPISODES.—For the Belgian, Polish, Italian, and Portuguese wars, see the "Catal. du Dépôt de la Guerre."—For the Austrian war of 1848-49 in Lombardy, **Schoenhals**, "Campagnes d'Italie de 1848 et 1849," Fr. trans., 1859 (originally an anonymous publication: "Erinnerungen eines Oesterr. Veteranen . . .," 1852).—For the conflict between Prussia and Austria, **H. von Sybel**, "Die Begründung des Deutschen Reiches," vols. i-iii., 4th edit., 1893, personal information and extracts from Prussian archives which are still secret.—On the recognition of Napoleon by Europe, "Der Staatsstreich vom 2 Dec. 1851 und seine Rückwirkung auf Europa," 1870 (the anonymous author is **Geffcken**).—For the complications in the Orient, see the bibl. of the following chapter.

CHAPTER XXVII.

FRENCH PREPONDERANCE AND THE NATIONALIST WARS, 1854-70.

Transformations in European Policy.—The period from 1844 to 1854 had been a period of internal revolution and external peace; in 40 years there had been no great European war, no change in the Europe of 1815 but the creation of the two little kingdoms of Greece and Belgium and the destruction of the Republic of Cracow. With the Crimean war began a period of wars and territorial changes: in 16 years there were four European wars between great powers, not to mention the local wars in Italy and Denmark; all central Europe was rearranged.

This change was produced by the arrival in power of new rulers in France and Prussia, the two great powers which had hitherto remained inactive, and in Sardinia, a secondary state, which, in these years, raised itself to the rank of a European power.

In France, Napoleon III., invested with the power of declaring war and concluding treaties independently of the Chamber and of public opinion, was absolute master of foreign policy. His army was thought very strong, and he did not shrink from the idea of war. By suppression of her political life at home, France became a preponderating force in Europe. But Napoleon III. directed this force according to his personal views. He abandoned the monarchical tradition of a policy of peace and national interest. Formerly an Italian revolutionist and a partisan of Italian unity, he leaned toward a revolutionary policy. Openly hostile to the treaties of 1815 and to Austria also, advocating the right of peoples to determine their own political fortunes, he wished to destroy the work of the Allies. He wished to employ France in the disinterested work of helping the oppressed nationalities to emancipate themselves, expecting as recompense some increase of territory for France—what Bismarck ironically called a *pourboire* (waiter's tip). This was the "policy of nation-

alities," combined with a policy of annexations. But Napoleon's personal adherents were divided into two hostile parties: the revolutionary party, directed by Prince Jerome, urged intervention on behalf of nationalism and a war against Austria; the conservative party, represented by the Empress, wanted peace and maintenance of the Catholic powers. Napoleon, subject to personal influences, hesitated, wavered from one party to the other, took contradictory measures; sometimes he even concealed his actions from his ministers, and took, through secret agents, steps opposed to the official line of conduct decided on by his government. This gave his policy an incoherent and tortuous appearance.

In Sardinia, the new King, Victor Emmanuel, had a small but efficient army. He left the direction of his foreign policy to Cavour (see p. 348), an Italian patriot who was determined to achieve Italian unity by any and all means.

Prussia remained passive until William I. succeeded to the throne. Although personally a lover of peace, like his two predecessors, William was before everything commander of the army, and might be persuaded to face a war. After 1862 he left the direction of his foreign policy to Bismarck, a German patriot, who had determined to secure German unity by force of arms. Now the Prussian army, by its universal service, perfected armament, rapid mobilization, and skilful tactics, was to show itself the strongest army in Europe.

In face of these three powers which were beginning to act, the powers which had controlled Europe were reduced to a passive rôle. Austria, weakened by Hungarian nationalist opposition and disturbed by financial complications, had only a defensive policy. Emperor Francis Joseph, who conducted her foreign affairs, had no love for war. He was, however, unable to avoid it, and went into it under unfavourable conditions, with an army ill equipped, ill commanded, and slow in its movements. In Russia Nicholas had been succeeded, in 1855, by Alexander, a humane and peace-loving prince, who reigned twenty years without making war in Europe. In England Palmerston continued to manage foreign affairs until his death in 1865, but his measures of intimidation no longer influenced powers that had decided on war. England, with her small army of volunteers, could not fight against the continental armies, with their compulsory military service. The English government resigned itself to the impotence which was now plain to the eyes of the

world. It abstained from military policy, except where a vital English interest was to be defended.

Europe was led, during this period, by France, Italy, and Prussia,—in other words, by Napoleon, Cavour, and Bismarck,—and her policy depended upon their relations. All three had a common ground of interest, the principle of nationalities and opposition to Austria. The former European concert rested on the “maintenance of the treaties,” but the revolutions of '48, by realizing for a moment the new nations, Italian, German, and Hungarian, had shaken the system that the treaties had established. They had brought up new questions of nationality all over central Europe. The reaction had crushed the nationalist movements without solving these problems. They were to come up again; but this time the conservative power, Austria, found itself alone against Napoleon, Cavour, and Bismarck, who had become allies of nationalist revolution.

The Crimean War (1853-56).—The war between the Sultan and the Tsar, instead of remaining localized as in 1828, became a European war. Napoleon III., desiring to make himself a position in Europe, had joined the English government to defend the Ottoman Empire. France and England had together sent their fleets to Constantinople. The Russian fleet, crossing the Black Sea, came to destroy the Turkish fleet at Sinope, November 30, 1853. In England public indignation was aroused against the Aberdeen ministry and Prince Albert, who desired to maintain peace; the English did not want to leave the Russians masters of the Black Sea. The English government decided to accept Napoleon's propositions. The united English and French fleets entered the Black Sea, in January, 1854, with orders to request the withdrawal of all Russian ships to Sebastopol. The Tsar was displeased, and determined to break with France and England.

The rupture was retarded by negotiations with the two German states. France and England finally demanded the withdrawal of the Russian troops from the Roumanian principalities, which the Tsar refused. They then concluded a treaty with the Sultan, promising him the aid of an army and engaging not to treat separately (March 12). On March 27 they declared war on Russia, and on April 10 agreed not to seek any individual advantage in the war. They invited the other powers to join them; the King of Prussia refused from aversion to the revolutionary projects of Napoleon and Palmerston; in order to keep Austria neutral, he promised to support her in case of attack.

The Allies were at first unwilling to free the Roumanian provinces from the Russian occupation because this would remove Austria's sole motive for joining against the Tsar. They confined themselves to a defensive war. A small Franco-English army was sent to Gallipoli to defend Constantinople, and an expedition was sent to the Piræus to check the Greeks. As the Russians did not advance, the army re-embarked, and at the request of the Turks proceeded to Varna; thence to the Dobrudja, where it was decimated by cholera. These operations were conducted slowly and confusedly.

The Tsar still hesitated; he tried to conciliate his former allies, Prussia and Austria. He finally evacuated Roumania, thus leaving no motive for war. But France and England wanted to assure the future; they arranged with Austria "points" to impose on the Tsar: 1. The Roumanian principalities to be under European guarantee, instead of Russian; 2. free navigation of the Danube; 3. revision of the Straits Convention to neutralize the Black Sea; 4. protection of the Sultan's Christian subjects without injury to his sovereignty (August 8). Russia rejected the four "points," declaring that she would await the progress of events. The Austrians and Turks occupied the Roumanian provinces in September.

The defensive war was at an end. Napoleon proposed to incite revolt in the Caucasus; England preferred to attack Sebastopol, Russia's military seaport on the Black Sea. Thus the war for the protection of the Ottoman Empire led to an expedition against the Crimea.

The Russians were not expecting an attack from this direction; they had stationed 200,000 men on the Baltic Sea, 140,000 in Poland, 180,000 on the Danube, and only 50,000 in the Crimea. The little Russian army could not prevent the landing of the allies, but it was intrenched on steep ground, and the battle of Alma, September 30, was so bloody that the Franco-English army gave the garrison of Sebastopol time to improve the defences of the place by scuttling the ships in the bay and raising earthworks. The French general Canrobert, when he reached Sebastopol, did not venture an assault; he conducted a regular siege.

It was a slow and murderous siege, which absorbed all the forces of the allies. The besieging army had been attacked by cholera, which delayed their operations. When they were ready for the assault, a Russian army came to the assistance of the city

and forced them to fight on the plain and in the valleys the bloody battles of Inkermann and Balaklava, in November, 1854. The allies had to face a winter campaign in a desert country, in intense cold; nothing had been prepared. The English army, poorly sheltered and provisioned, lost half of its numbers. English opinion was aroused, and insisted on the resignation of the Aberdeen ministry.

The allies sent new troops and were re-enforced by a Turkish army which on its arrival fought at Eupatoria, February, 1855. Sardinia sent an army corps. Sardinia joined the war in January to please the Western powers and flatter Napoleon. Austria also had concluded an offensive alliance in the preceding month, and urged Prussia and the Diet to prepare for war. But the Diet, though hitherto obedient to Austria, refused to move, and Austria dared not act alone.

All at once Nicholas died (March 2, 1855), from chagrin, it was said, at being conquered by the Turks. The war had no further purpose, and negotiations for its termination were opened at Vienna. The negotiations failed because Alexander refused the third point, to limit the number of Russian war vessels on the Black Sea, to which England clung obstinately. The allies therefore completed the siege of Sebastopol; a bombardment was still necessary (250,000 cannon shots, 8000 killed, in April)—a battle (Tchernäia, in May),—the attack on the Mamelon fort (in June; 13,000 killed),—an unsuccessful assault,—a second bombardment,—an assault on the Malakoff. The Russians destroyed everything, then evacuated the place (September).

The allies, masters of Sebastopol, did not know how to force the Tsar to peace. Napoleon proposed to excite nationalist wars in Poland, Finland, and the Caucasus, or to make a naval war by blockading the Baltic. But the Anglo-French fleet in the Baltic in 1854 and 1855 had been able to bombard only isolated points; Sweden did not dare enter the war. England desired only a limited war. Napoleon decided in November to make peace, against the wishes of Palmerston, who threatened to continue the war alone with the Turks. Austria undertook to present to the Tsar an ultimatum containing four points, which the Tsar accepted in January, 1856, and the powers concerned decided to arrange the conditions of peace in a congress at Paris.

The Congress of Paris (1856).—The Congress of Paris, in March and April, 1856, was composed of two plenipotentiaries from each of the six powers, France, England, Russia, Turkey,

Austria, and Sardinia, under the presidency of the French plenipotentiaries; Prussia was afterward invited to join.

The Congress began by settling the Eastern question.

1. The integrity of the Ottoman Empire was guaranteed by the powers; the Sultan promised reforms (see p. 626), and the powers renounced any right of intervention in the internal affairs of the Empire.

2. The Danube was declared open to navigation; a commission of representatives from the seven powers was to take measures to make the river navigable and establish tolls to cover the expenses; the supervision was then to pass into the hands of a commission from the bordering states.

3. The Black Sea was declared neutral, and no state was to have on its coast any maritime arsenals nor any vessels of war, beyond the number, not to exceed ten, of small ships requisite for policing the coasts.

4. Moldavia and Wallachia became self-governing (see p. 640).

After signing the peace, the Congress regulated the question of maritime law by four decisions which became part of European international law: 1. Privateering is abolished; 2. All enemy property, other than contraband, carried under a neutral flag is exempt from capture; 3. all neutral merchandise under the enemy's flag is similarly exempt; 4. blockade may not be established by a simple declaration; it is valid only when effective.

Cavour, representing Sardinia, succeeded in bringing up the Italian question in the Congress by making terms with the representatives of France and England. These spoke of the evacuation of the Piræus by the French troops, and used the occasion thus afforded to bring up the continued occupation of Tuscany by the Austrians; England asked that it should cease. Austria refused to discuss the matter. But Cavour took advantage of this opportunity to describe the lamentable condition of Italy.

Napoleon's Predominance (1856-59).—The Congress of Paris had been a personal success for Napoleon and his policy. Not only had he gained the admission of France into the European concert, but for the first time he had had a European congress meet on his territory and under his presidency. He had secured autonomy for the Roumanians and brought up the Italian nationalist question, making the instrument Metternich had created against the nationalities serve in the nationalist cause. He was attached to this idea, and his policy aimed at the calling of

a new congress to make over Europe and abolish the treaties of 1815; but without success.

The Congress of Paris changed Napoleon's position in Europe. The sovereigns, seeing him firm at home and powerful abroad, made advances to him. The example was set by the princes of the Coburg family; Ernest of Coburg-Gotha was the first to make him a visit; after him came Leopold, King of the Belgians, then the King of Portugal; finally Prince Albert, consort of Queen Victoria, consented to see Napoleon, in September, 1854. Napoleon and the Empress went to England the following April, and Victoria and Albert returned their visit—the first time since 1422 that an English sovereign had visited Paris. The Coburg example decided Victor Emmanuel, who had hitherto refused. After the Congress of 1856 the sovereigns of Wurtemberg, Bavaria, and Tuscany visited France.

Napoleon wished to use these relations to take up an active policy again. He sought to gain the King of Prussia, but failed; in August, 1857, he spoke to the English ministry of revising the treaties of 1815, but was coldly received. He then approached Russia, having an interview with the Tsar at Stuttgart in October, 1857. In 1858 France and Russia worked together for Roumanian unity against Turkey, Austria, and England; in Servia they combined to support the Obrenovitch against Austria.

Alliance between France and Sardinia (1858).—Cavour, who had decided to make war on Austria, declared publicly to the Chamber that the principles of Vienna and those of Turin were irreconcilable. In May, 1856, Austria replied that the Emperor would continue to use his right of intervention. The following year (March, 1857) the Austrian government severed diplomatic relations with Sardinia.

Napoleon still hesitated. Orsini, a Mazzinist, in January, 1858, attempted to kill him for having failed to keep the oath he had sworn in his youth to work for the independence of Italy. The attempt made a great impression on Napoleon; he had Orsini's letter published (see p. 351). He then sent for Cavour, and the two, meeting secretly at Plombières, concluded an alliance and prepared for war (July, 1858). The practical conditions were soon arranged: all the Austrian possessions in Italy for Sardinia, Savoy for France; and eventually Parma and Modena for Sardinia, and in this case Nice for France. But they had difficulty in arranging a pretext for the war; Napoleon was unwilling to appear in support of a revolution. As the price of

the alliance, Victor Emmanuel gave Princess Clotilde in marriage to Prince Jerome, the Emperor's cousin, a partisan of nationalist schemes. Napoleon hoped to profit by the nationalist uprisings in Italy to give Tuscany to his cousin, and the Kingdom of Naples to Prince Murat. In order to isolate Austria he sent his cousin to the Tsar, who promised neutrality; he asked Prussia for her alliance, but was refused.

Meanwhile Napoleon, disturbed by conspiracies against his person, had conducted a diplomatic campaign against the French refugees. He secured a special law for the repression of insults to foreign sovereigns, in Sardinia by Cavour, in Belgium by the new Liberal ministry. But in England the bill presented by Palmerston, coupled with the anti-English utterances in France, offended national sentiment, and the House of Commons rejected the measure (February, 1858). The ministry resigned, and the new Tory ministry, under Derby, showed a more friendly disposition toward Austria.

The Italian War (1859).—The project of war on Austria had been kept secret. It was suddenly announced by two significant utterances: the one, a word from Napoleon to the Austrian ambassador, at the New Year's reception in 1859; the other, a sentence in Victor Emmanuel's speech from the throne on January 10, in which mention is made of the "cry of pain which resounded from so many parts of Italy." Armament began on both sides.

England, on request from Austria, offered her mediation, invited France and Sardinia to set forth their grievances, and proposed the evacuation of the Italian states and certain reforms. Napoleon appeared to hesitate. The war was popular in France, especially with the liberal and Republican parties, the enemies of the government. It was regarded with disfavour by the ministers, the Empress, the salons, the Catholics, and the business world. Napoleon got Russia to propose a congress, his favourite idea (March, 1859). Austria insisted that Sardinia should not be invited to the Congress and that she should disarm. England proposed that all the Italian states should be invited and that both sides should disarm at once; Napoleon could not confess that he wanted the war; he had to accept England's proposal, and telegraphed Cavour to accept also. Cavour was in despair, but replied that he would obey. It was Austria that brought on the war by sending to the King of Sardinia an ultimatum demanding his promise to disarm within three days. Sardinia refused to comply, and the Austrian army entered Sardinian ter-

ritory. Austria thus appeared to have made the war, and was left in isolation.

The war of 1859 consisted of two operations which showed the almost equal disorder and incoherency of direction of the two armies. Austria, with 250,000 men, had only 110,000 at her disposal; 32 French regiments had an effective force of less than 1400 men; mobilization was slow and incomplete on both sides.

1. The Austrian army of 100,000 men, instead of taking the offensive against the Sardinian army of only 70,000, gave the French, with 130,000 men, time to join the Sardinians at Alessandria. Then, thinking that the enemy was about to march southward on Parma, the Austrians sent a detachment to prevent the movement; but this force was repulsed at Montebello. Meanwhile the Franco-Sardinian army, passing to the north, took the offensive and entered Lombardy (battle of the advance-guard at Palestro, May 30). The Austrians fell back to the defence of Milan and took a position in the plain behind a canal. The decisive battle of Magenta was a confused struggle conducted without any general plan. A partial attack by the French on the bridge of the canal was followed by a series of combats between re-enforcements sent by both sides. The Austrian general had already telegraphed the news of his victory, and Napoleon believed himself beaten, when MacMahon's corps, arriving at the last minute, compelled the Austrians to retreat. The French army, in disorder, spent the night where they stood, without pursuing the enemy. The result was the retreat of the Austrians from Lombardy, followed by a nationalist revolution there.

2. The Austrian army formed again in Venetia, where the Emperor came to place himself at its head. Re-enforced to 200,000 men, after much hesitation it took the offensive once more in order to reconquer Lombardy. The Franco-Sardinian army, somewhat fewer in number, marched on the Mincio. The two armies met unexpectedly, each being ignorant of the other's movements. The unexpected battle of Solferino, on June 24, consisted of three separate affairs: one in the north, where the Sardinian army was checked; another in the south, where Niel held firm and accused Canrobert of not having supported him (they had a duel later); the third in the centre, where the taking of Solferino by the French compelled the Austrians to retreat.

Peace with Austria (1859).—Napoleon, agitated by the sight of the battlefield, disturbed by quarrels between his generals, became disgusted with the war; he did not feel strong enough to

overcome the Quadrilateral. He thought to distract Austria by revolution in Hungary; he had put himself in personal communication with Kossuth, the leader of the Hungarian refugees, and had had him come to Paris. He now summoned him to Italy. But he feared a rupture with England.

The German public, alarmed at France's success, urged Prussia to take Austria's part. Prince William had been waiting to make Austria accept his conditions, but he finally mobilized and threatened the Rhine frontier. Napoleon, not to leave the powers time to impose their mediation on him, negotiated directly with the Emperor of Austria. A personal interview at Villafranca on July 11 settled the preliminaries of peace. The final treaty was concluded at Zurich in November, 1859: Lombardy alone was ceded to Sardinia; Tuscany and Modena were to be restored to their princes, and an Italian federation was provided for. Except for the cession of Lombardy, no clause of the agreement was carried out.

Annexations and the Italian Question (1860-62).—Napoleon let Italian unity get accomplished by Italian revolutionists, assisted by the Sardinian government (see pp. 351-54), and in return for his neutrality obtained Savoy and Nice.

This annexation excited general distrust of Napoleon. Switzerland claimed the part of Savoy declared neutral by the treaties of 1815, and the Swiss Federal Council talked of military occupation. The King of Holland, who had been on unfriendly terms with Belgium since 1830, paid a visit to the King of the Belgians. In Germany the *National Union* protested against the annexation. In England volunteer militia was formed to defend the coast against a landing of French troops.

Napoleon protested that he had no thought but of peace; he worked in harmony with England in China, Syria, and Turkey, and concluded the treaty of commerce of 1860. But the distrust continued. England, Prussia, and Austria arranged to discuss together every international communication coming from France.

The creation of the Kingdom of Italy had brought up the Roman question (p. 356). Napoleon tried to secure a congress to settle it peaceably, but Europe did not want one. He still hesitated, not daring either to withdraw his garrison from Rome or to recognise the Kingdom of Italy, the outcome of a revolution condemned by the Pope. Then he made a compromise. Against the wishes of the Empress, he recognised the Kingdom

of Italy, on June 15, 1861, but with the qualification that he would not guarantee it and did not wish to detract from the value of the protests of the *curia*. He wrote personally to Victor Emmanuel that his past obliged him to leave his troops in Rome; but he replaced his ambassador, Gramont, a partisan of the Pope, by sending Lavalette, a partisan of Italy. He instructed the new ambassador to propose to the Pope to cede his provinces to the King of Italy as vicar. The Pope replied that he and his cardinals were bound by their oath to maintain the integrity of the States of the Church. After Garibaldi's attempt (p. 354) Napoleon took as ministers supporters of the Pope and of the peace with Austria (October, 1862).

The Polish Affairs (1863).—Napoleon, disgusted with affairs in Italy, returned to the nationalist question in Poland. After some years of nationalistic agitation, the Poles had revolted in order to induce the powers to intervene. Insurgent bands came from outside, notably from Austria. In all the great states, public opinion was loud in favour of intervention.

The Tsar, hampered by finding himself isolated and censured, addressed himself personally to the King of Prussia; Bismarck used this opportunity to establish an understanding between Prussia and Russia. He concluded a convention in February, 1863, to combine the military action of the two states against the insurgents, and against the wish of all Germany declared himself openly hostile to the Poles. The other great powers, Austria, England, and France, took the part of Poland.

Napoleon first addressed the Tsar in a personal letter, urging him to restore the Kingdom of Poland. On his refusal Napoleon proposed to make a common war on Russia; England refused. The three powers agreed only to propose to the Tsar certain reforms in Poland, and loaded him with diplomatic communications. They did not wish, however, to go so far as to make war. The Russian government knew it, and the affair was limited to the exchange of notes (p. 600). Austria, threatened with war by Russia, put Galicia under martial law in order to hasten the end of the insurrection. England, busy with the question of the Elbe duchies, deserted Poland. Napoleon attempted his favourite method: he invited the powers to a congress to settle all the pending questions—Poland, the duchies, and Rome, and to revise the treaties of 1815. England, by way of answer, showed the futility of such a congress.

Napoleon thus remained isolated and powerless—at variance

with the Tsar, and entangled in the Roman question. He had lost his predominance; Prussia, with the Tsar's alliance, was to succeed to it.

The War of the Duchies (1864).—The question of the duchies of Schleswig-Holstein, opened in 1848, and closed by the powers' decision in 1852, was reopened by the extinction of the Danish dynasty in 1863 (p. 572). The German states supported the Duke of Augustenburg; the European powers defended the integrity of the Danish monarchy; Austria and Prussia took an intermediate position, accepting the Glücksburg succession guaranteed by Europe, but rejecting the new Danish constitution (January, 1864). There were then three parties: 1. Denmark, supported by the great non-German powers; 2. the Duke of Augustenburg, supported by the States of Germany; 3. Prussia and Austria.

The Danish government was counting on European intervention. England declared to Prussia that she did not guarantee neutrality, and proposed a conference of the powers that had signed the treaty of 1852 (December, 1863). But Napoleon, displeased with England for having abandoned him in the Polish affair, thought to apply the "principle of nationalities" by uniting to Germany the German parts of the duchies. He refused armed assistance to Denmark. Queen Victoria did not want war, and the English ministry dared not send an ultimatum. Prussia and Austria began the war of the duchies in January, 1864. It is divided into three acts.

1. The Danish army of 35,000 men, intrenched behind the lines of the Danewerk, had received orders that the operations should be dragged out long enough to give Europe time to intervene, but not to expose itself to defeat, for it was the only Danish army. The Austro-Prussian army, of 70,000 men, was instructed to destroy the Danish army without giving it time to reach the lines of retreat in case of an attempt to retire to Jutland. It attacked the Danewerk, but the Danish army, without waiting to be forced, withdrew by night and escaped. The allies took possession of the whole of Schleswig in January and February, 1864.

2. The Danish army, stationed behind the Düppel intrenchments, barred the entrance to Jutland. The operations against Düppel, in March and April, consisted of a five-weeks' blockade, a bombardment, and a general assault of six columns against the redoubts. The Danes evacuated Jutland, and the allies occupied

it. England had finally succeeded in organizing the London Conference; but when it opened, on April 12, the taking of Düppel had already practically settled the question; victorious Prussia and Austria no longer wished to recognise the treaties of 1852 and demanded the complete separation of the duchies from Denmark. England offered France to agree on an ultimatum. France recalled "the deplorable issue" of their course in the Polish question and asked if England was willing to conclude an offensive alliance. England made no reply, and the conference broke up without accomplishing anything.

3. When the armistice had expired, in June, the allies invaded the islands. The Danish government asked for peace. The peace of Vienna, concluded in October 30, ceded the duchies to Prussia and Austria.

Rupture between Prussia and Austria (1864-66).—Austria and Prussia had been in conflict since 1860, when reform of the Confederation had been attempted (p. 465). But the Austrian government, having fallen out with the German states on the question of the duchies, had made overtures to Prussia.

The conflict began again with the question of determining the disposition of the duchies they had conquered together. A special council of the Prussian ministers, July 21, 1865, declared Austria's concessions insufficient and advised immediate war. But King William was unwilling to attack, and Austria, having no money, wished to avoid a war. The Gastein Convention in August settled the question provisionally by dividing the duchies. France protested against this act as a violation of the principle of nationalities and the popular will, and as a revival of a procedure that had become obsolete in Europe. Thus the French theory of popular right as expressed by *plebiscite*, was avowed, in opposition to the traditional theory of the *right of conquest* adopted by Prussia. (On the famous formula, *La force prime le droit*, Force masters law, by which the French public characterize Bismarck's policy, see p. 463.)

Napoleon had made advances to Italy, bringing up the Roman question by the September convention, 1864. The peace party, which had held the ministry since 1862, hoped to reconcile Italy with Austria by inducing the latter to give up Venetia. But the Italian government wished to keep its army ready, and Austria still refused to recognise the Kingdom of Italy.

Bismarck tried to conclude an alliance with Italy against Austria. Italy could do nothing that France did not approve; Na-

napoleon's authorization must therefore be obtained. Bismarck came to ask it of him. The Biarritz interview of October, 1865,* was the decisive act of this negotiation. Napoleon resumed his personal policy: to bring about the national unity of Italy, to fortify Prussia against Austria, and to profit by the conflict to gain territory and destroy the treaties of 1815.† Bismarck's game was to encourage these hopes without making any formal engagement. He prevailed on Napoleon to promise the neutrality of France.

With Italy the negotiation was long. The Italian government, having twice already received a proposition of alliance, in 1862 and 1865, no longer believed in Bismarck's sincerity, suspecting him of using Italy to alarm Austria. When the conflict with Austria became bitter Prussia sounded the Italian government, and an Italian general was sent to Berlin. But the negotiations dragged along without result. Italy hoped to gain Venetia without war, in exchange for Roumania, which had become vacant (p. 644). In Prussia both King William and most of the ministers desired peace. Bismarck, however, succeeded in obtaining an offensive alliance for three months on April 8. Italy promised armed support to Prussia's plans for the reform of the Confederation, and Prussia promised to secure the cession of Venetia. Italy had wished not merely Venetia but "the Italian territories subject to Austria,"—which would have included the Tyrol, a part of the German Confederation; this Bismarck had declined to agree to. Napoleon promised neutrality.

Austria's policy was to delay a rupture in Germany in order to force Prussia, by taking the aggressive rôle, to alienate the German States (which plan succeeded) and in Europe to isolate Prussia by satisfying Italy. She proposed to Prussia, on April 25, that both sides should disarm, but not in Italy. She left France the hope that she would cede Venetia if Italy remained neutral. As compensation for Venetia she spoke of taking back Silesia from Prussia.

Napoleon, divided between Prince Jerome and the Catholic party, hesitated. He fell back on his favorite idea of a congress,

* Bismarck had gone to Biarritz the preceding year, but Napoleon and his minister of foreign affairs had not taken him seriously.

† In a speech at Auxerre, May 6, 1866, he said: "I detest these treaties of 1815, which we are expected to-day to make the basis of our foreign policy." Thiers had just made in the Chamber a speech against Prussia and German unity which was applauded even by the imperialist majority,

to revise the map of Europe. England and Russia agreed; Prussia and Italy, from regard for Napoleon, had agreed beforehand. Austria defeated the scheme by demanding that no increase of territory should be discussed and that the Pope should be invited.

The rupture came in Germany, in the Diet (p. 470). Prussia, reassured on the French side, removed her garrisons from the western frontier and concentrated all her powers against Austria and her allies.

The War of 1866.—War broke out at once in Bohemia, Venetia, and Germany, between Prussia allied with Italy and Austria allied with most of the German States. Like all the rest of Europe, Napoleon believed that as the forces were almost equal the war would be a long one; he was planning, when the belligerents were exhausted, to intervene as an all-powerful arbiter, without even needing to fight. This scheme was baffled by an unexpected development, the unprecedented swiftness of the Prussian army's successes.

For her war against Austria, Prussia mobilized 300,000 men and formed three separate armies,—the army of the Elbe, the first army of Silesia, and the second army of Silesia,—which entered Bohemia from three sides, and driving before them the Saxons and Austrians (June 26-30) manœuvred to come together again. The Austrian army, comprising 220,000 men, was more slowly mobilized, did not defend the defiles, and was reduced to the defensive. It concentrated itself in a fortified position in Königgrätz, already demoralized by the quick movements of the Prussians and the rapid fire of their needle-guns.

The war was decided in a single day. Two of the three Prussian armies (the Elbe and first Silesia) had met and were awaiting the third, which had to traverse more difficult passages. They attacked the Austrian army, intrenched on the steep heights of a forest country, defended by artillery arranged tier over tier. The battle of Sadowa or Königgrätz, on July 3, was long and bloody. It was decided by the arrival of the third Prussian army, which penetrated to the midst of the Austrian positions without having been perceived. The Austrian general, Benedek, said it was concealed by mist. The Austrians, having lost 25,000 men and 20,000 prisoners, retreated in disorder. They could do nothing more to hinder the enemy's march on Vienna.

In Italy, the Austrian army had held itself on the defensive, guarding Venetia. The Italian army, which was larger, attacked

it and was driven back. This was the battle of Custoza, June 24, which forced the Italians to fall back into Lombardy. After the news of Sadowa, the Italians made it a point of honour to conquer Venetia themselves; but the Italian army gained no decisive success, and their fleet was destroyed at Lissa by the Austrian fleet.

Peace of Prague (1866).—The Austrian government, in order to concentrate its forces against Prussia, ceded Venetia to Napoleon, begging him to negotiate peace with Italy (July 5). Napoleon seemed to be the arbiter of Europe. The minister of foreign affairs, who favoured Austria, urged him to mobilize and stop Prussia by threatening to take possession of the left bank of the Rhine, which was unprotected. But the minister of war confessed that the army was disorganized by the Mexican expedition and that he could not get together more than 40,000 men. Napoleon, who was in ill health, hesitated between two policies: whether to impose peace on Prussia or negotiate with her to secure advantage for himself.* He thus let slip the moment for intimidating Prussia by a demonstration on the Rhine. The policy of the Prussian government was to put Napoleon off with vague promises, keeping him passive while the Prussian army was marching on Vienna.

Napoleon first tried to check Italy by threatening to join Austria against her (July 9); Italy replied that she could agree to nothing without Prussia and refused an armistice. Napoleon then sent to the Prussian camp to ask the King to authorize a truce for Italy. He then proposed the bases of a peace (July 14): integrity of Austria, dissolution of the Confederation, confederation of northern Germany, and cession by Austria of her right in the duchies. On these conditions all were agreed. The difficulty was in arranging additions of territory; Prussia wished to annex several German states, but Austria dared not abandon her allies to that fate. Napoleon wanted to secure some territory to

* On July 4, at eleven o'clock at night, he signed a decree convoking the Chambers to vote the mobilization; on the 5th, at 5 o'clock in the morning, he countermanded the order. He held a council on the 5th; on the advice of Drouyn and the Empress, he decided to continue the preparations for war; then, on Lavalette's representation of the bad condition of the French army and the superiority of the needle gun, he suspended his decision; Drouyn insisted, saying that a military demonstration on the Rhine would suffice; Jerome objected on the ground that after having encouraged Prussia, a hostile attitude would make a bad impression. Napoleon remained undecided.

compensate France for the increase of Prussia. But Bismarck knew that Prussia's army made her mistress of the situation, and he stood out for his own terms.

By the preliminary peace of Nikolsburg, July 26, Austria withdrew from German affairs, ceding her right in the duchies and leaving Prussia free to establish a new confederation and to annex the North German states except Saxony. Bismarck made concessions of form: 1. The German states south of the Main, left out of the new confederation, should have the right to form a union of their own. 2. The northern districts of Schleswig should be restored to Denmark if their population so wished. The final peace of Prague of August 23 preserved these two clauses, but they remained illusory.

Napoleon asked Prussia for a territorial enlargement, and the Prussian envoy let him hope for one (July 19). When the Tsar proposed a congress to settle the changes in Germany, it was Napoleon himself that refused, hoping to gain more from Prussia. He offered a secret understanding for mutual enlargement: France to have the possessions of Bavaria and Hesse on the left bank of the Rhine. Bismarck insisted upon a written draft of the scheme (to use against Napoleon), then refused it, and later published it in a conversation with a correspondent of the *Siècle*. In face of the commotion in Germany, Napoleon withdrew his project, denied the rumours of negotiation (August 12), and turned to Belgium. He proposed (August 20) that Prussia should aid France to acquire Belgium and Luxemburg. Bismarck had the plan written out at Napoleon's dictation; he published it in 1870, to embroil England and Belgium with France.*

The South German states were isolated and quickly crushed by Prussia. They at once asked for France's mediation; but Bismarck showed them Napoleon's plans for annexation at their expense, and in August induced them to conclude with Prussia secret treaties of offensive and defensive alliance.

Napoleon therefore obtained no positive result, and Prussia, by a single war, acquired first place in Germany. Europe had done nothing to prevent it. Prussia's new methods of fighting had made the European concert powerless.

The Luxemburg Affair (1867).—The Grand Duchy of Luxemburg, after the dissolution of the Germanic Confederation, re-

*The Germans in 1870 seized the Rouher papers and published the report of the French envoy Benedetti on this negotiation.

mained occupied by the Prussian garrison of the federal fortress (see p. 243). Its sovereign, the King of Holland, was anxious to sell it; Napoleon grasped at this opportunity to secure additional territory. He believed that the Prussian government was only awaiting a pretext to withdraw its garrison in such a way as not to offend German public opinion; Bismarck left him under this delusion. The King of Holland agreed to sell, provided Prussia would consent; Bismarck did not refuse distinctly, but on March 19, 1867, he published the treaties concluded with the South German states in 1866, so as to show Prussia's power. He told the King of Holland that he would leave to him the responsibility for his acts. The King, believing that Bismarck wished only to have his hand forced, notified Napoleon that the sale would be made (March 30).

The treaty of cession had been drawn up and announced to Europe, when an interpellation was made in the Reichstag on the rumour of a sale of German territory by a prince of German blood. Bismarck replied that nothing had yet been arranged and sent word to the King of Holland that in the present agitated condition of opinion in Germany the cession of Luxemburg would result in war. The King withdrew his consent, in spite of French insistence. Napoleon seemed to shrink from the crisis. This was a diplomatic victory for Prussia.

The question of the federal fortress was settled by a European conference, which revised the treaty of 1839.

Latent Conflict between France and Prussia (1867-70).—By the superiority of her army Prussia had won first place in Europe, and she was preparing a complete union of Germany. The other great powers were not reconciled to these two revolutions, which threatened the old balance of power in Europe. But Austria was discouraged, England powerless, and the Tsar opposed to war. France felt strong enough single-handed to check Prussia and restore her own predominance. Public opinion in France had suddenly become hostile to German unity; people talked of "avenging Sadowa." In Prussia national pride, exalted by success, showed itself in threats against the "hereditary enemy." But on both sides these warlike sentiments were counterbalanced by the fear of a war which all felt would be a terrible one.

A period of hesitation followed. The visit of the Tsar and the King of Prussia to the World's Exposition at Paris in 1867 seemed to promise peace. But the interview between Napoleon and the Emperor of Austria in August, 1867, disturbed the public

mind, especially when Napoleon, on his return to France, referred in an official speech to "black clouds on the horizon." The party formerly in favour of peace (with Austria) now became a war party and sought alliances against Prussia. In Austria the Emperor had given the direction of foreign policy to a former minister of the King of Saxony and an enemy to Prussia, Count Beust, who still hoped to restore Austria to her old position in Germany.

Then came a series of agitations in the East, fomented, it was said, by French agents, to occupy Russia and keep her from interfering in the West. The revolt in Crete, supported by Greece (1866-68), a movement in Bulgaria excited by bands from Roumania (1868), a Roumanian agitation and armament (1868), a conspiracy in Serbia, and a gathering of Polish refugees in Galicia, following each other in close succession. The Tsar, however, remained calm, and quiet was soon restored.

The French government was counting on Denmark against Prussia. Bismarck, before taking, in Schleswig, the *plebiscite* promised in 1866, asked special guarantees for protection of the Germans in Schleswig (1867); then, as no agreement could be made regarding the territory to be ceded, he broke off the negotiations in March, 1868. The Danish government sent its minister of war to Paris in April. The Austrian and Italian governments also wished to join France. But in Austria Beust was fettered by the Hungarians, who favoured peace, and the Germans, who hated France; in Italy the *Consorteria* ministry, favouring the French alliance, was intimidated by the Radicals, who were irritated by the Mentana affair. These wished to join Prussia and force France to abandon Rome. The whole negotiation was secret, and its nature has been interpreted in various ways, but no practical result was accomplished.

The occasion was the purchase of the Belgian railroads by the French Eastern Company, in February, 1869; the Belgian government forbade the sale. The French government attributed this check to Bismarck. Napoleon was annoyed, and proposed to Austria and Italy a triple alliance to put a stop to Prussia's encroachments and restore Austria to her old place in Germany. The negotiation was conducted by the ambassadors (March). Austria accepted the defensive alliance, but reserved the right of neutrality if France were the one to begin war (April). The Italians asked that the French troops might be withdrawn from Rome, and were content with Napoleon's promise to withdraw

them as soon as possible; but when, in August, it became necessary to ratify the project, the Italian ministry demanded the immediate withdrawal from Rome, and a declaration that France would not again intervene in Italian affairs. The negotiation hung in the balance; each of the three sovereigns simply promised to conclude no other alliance without notifying the other two. Napoleon then accepted a parliamentary ministry whose head, Ollivier, had declared himself in favour of peace and reconciliation with Germany. This ministry, in January, 1870, revived the plan for securing the peace of Europe by getting both France and Prussia to disarm; England agreed to transmit it. France offered to diminish her yearly military contingent by 10,000 men. Bismarck made the objection that Prussia's organization made disarmament impossible (February, 1870).

The proposition made to the Reichstag on February 24, to admit the Grand Duchy of Baden into the northern confederation, renewed the agitation against Prussia and German unity; Bismarck was reproached with having failed to reply that this would be contrary to the treaty of Prague, whereby the independence of the states south of the Main was guaranteed. Bismarck replied, through his newspapers, that the treaty did not forbid the Southern States to join the northern confederation. The Austrian Archduke Albert passed some weeks in Paris, studying the French military situation. He proposed to Napoleon a plan of campaign; the French army, he said, was too weak to fight Prussia *alone*; it should invade South Germany, which the Austrian and Italian armies would enter through Bavaria. Napoleon kept this plan without speaking of it (March).

The Vatican Council, and later the plebiscite on the constitutional changes, engaged the attention of the French government. The Catholic powers had refrained from interfering in the convocation of the Council; but when, in February, the plan for the promulgation of infallibility came up, Daru, the French minister of foreign affairs, together with Napoleon, drew up a note reserving the rights of the state and announcing the sending of a French representative to the Council. Ollivier prevented this course, the Holy See having claimed the right of the Church to arrange its affairs freely (March). Daru drew up a note which Austria approved; the Roman *curia* refused to bring it before the Council (April). France could influence the Pope by threatening to withdraw her troops from Rome; Ollivier persuaded Napoleon to renounce this means. Daru completed his

rupture with Ollivier on the question of the *plebiscite* (see p. 184).

In the reconstitution of the ministry, Daru, who favoured peace, was replaced by Gramont, an enemy to Prussia. Napoleon communicated the Archduke's plan of campaign to certain French officers and sent General Lebrun to Vienna, with no official mission, to discuss with the Archduke modifications of his plan: Austria and Italy needed six weeks to mobilize; France, which would be ready much sooner, would enter upon the campaign in South Germany; Austria and Italy would arm, but preserve their neutrality. Lebrun obtained a private audience with the Emperor of Austria, who told him he could not declare war at the same time with France (June).^{*} Napoleon seemed to have given up the idea of war, for the minister of war asked the Chamber for 10,000 less men, and Ollivier declared that peace had never been more assured, the governments having all learned the necessity of respecting the treaties on which Europe's peace rested, that of Paris for the East, that of Prague for Germany (June 30).

Declaration of War (1870).—Peace seemed assured, Napoleon was ill, and the Prussian government taking a vacation, when a diplomatic incident suddenly produced a complication which in a few days led to a war between the two first military powers in Europe.

Since 1869 the Spanish provisional government had been seeking a king (see p. 311). It offered the throne to a Catholic

^{*}Two French diplomats, the Duke of Gramont and Chaudordy, have given an interpretation of these negotiations that has been adopted in France by a proportion of the people and propagated by German historians hostile to Beust, who are disposed to believe in a secret plot prepared against Prussia.—Gramont said that France before declaring war had secured the aid of Austria and Italy; she had, if not a formal treaty, at least the promise that Austria would support her; neutrality was once a means to gain time for mobilization.—Chaudordy tells of Gramont's discussions (between July 15 and August 4, 1870) with Austrian and Italian ambassadors and military attachés—Metternich and Vitzthum, Nigra and Vimercati; he thinks that neutrality was agreed on in order to give Austria and Italy time to arm, and that these states were to enter upon the campaign in September, on condition that a French army should have entered South Germany.—This interpretation rests on two ambiguous phrases in a letter from Beust to the Austrian ambassador, July 20, 1870.—As for Italy, Prince Jerome declared that the alliance was wrecked by discord on the Roman question. There is, therefore, no proof that the Triple Alliance was ever more than a project (see v. Sybel, "*Begründung des Deutschen Reiches*," vol. vii.).

prince, Leopold of Hohenzollern-Sigmaringen, allied to the imperial family of France.* The offer was made four times to the Prince's father; three times it was refused, but the fourth time it was accepted, July, 1870. The French government, which had known of the negotiations even in 1869, received official information from Spain; it did not reply directly, fearing to offend Spanish pride by appearing to interfere in the free choice of a king. It addressed the Prussian government, declaring that France had but a poor opinion of the selection. The coming of a Hohenzollern to Spain was regarded as a provocation and a menace from Prussia; France, it was said, could not suffer the Empire of Charles V. to be restored. In Berlin it was said, on the contrary, that the choice of a Spanish sovereign did not concern the Prussian government; that it was a private affair of the Hohenzollern family, and that William had no authority over the Sigmaringen branch.†

In the French Chamber a question was raised regarding the candidacy of a Hohenzollern for the Spanish throne. The French ministry, favouring peace by a large majority, prepared a peaceful answer. But Gramont, who considered the affair a plot of Bismarck's, added a sentence on the craftiness of Prussia; it was received with patriotic acclamations in the Chamber, and the papers began to talk of war (June 6).

*The idea was originated by Salazar, a Unionist Spanish deputy, in February, 1869: 1. Proposition made to the Prince's father, who refused in the spring of 1869; the French agent in Prussia, Benedetti, on hearing of it, questioned Bismarck, who seemed to consider the refusal as certain.—2. Proposition carried secretly to the prince's father, who, before beginning negotiations, asked the assurance that William and Napoleon approved, and informed Napoleon of it, September, 1869.—3. Proposition carried secretly with two personal letters from Prim to William and Bismarck in February, 1870; William advised a refusal; Bismarck, who advocated acceptance, was taken sick and left for the country.—4. Proposition from the Spanish government on June 14; the Prince accepted.

† Two opposite interpretations have been given to these facts. The Germans, who believed there was a plan on foot between the three Catholic powers to make war on Prussia, regarded the sudden opposition of the French government to the Hohenzollern candidacy as a pretext for use as a *casus belli*.—The French, on the contrary, believed it a ruse of Bismarck's to pique France's pride and lead her into a war. Von Sybel's demonstration shows that neither of these two interpretations has been *proved*. But a suggestion from the King of Roumania, Charles of Hohenzollern, in 1894, indicates that the candidacy was an instrument of Prussian policy.

The European powers disapproved the Prince's candidacy and desired to maintain peace; the English government tried to induce Spain to withdraw the offer. Napoleon personally charged the King of Belgium to induce the Prince to reconsider his acceptance. On July 12 the Prince withdrew it by an official declaration. The matter was thought to be settled. Ollivier announced that peace was assured, and the public funds rose 2 francs.

But Gramont had already put the question on a new ground and created a new complication. Convinced that the Hohenzollern prince was only the secret tool of the King of Prussia, he asked William to forbid the Prince to accept this candidacy, which was so offensive to France. "No one," he said, "will believe that a Prussian prince could accept the Spanish crown without permission from the King, the head of his family. . . . If the King has not given his permission, let him forbid it" (July 7). The King was taking the waters at Ems; the French government sent Benedetti there to present the new demand. The King replied that the matter was no affair of his government and that he had no power to forbid the Prince. Gramont, who felt sure that the King of Prussia made evasive answers in order to gain time for preparation, wished to oblige him to unmask; he gave orders to demand a categorical reply. He was trying to show Europe that Prussia was responsible for this affair and that France had forced her to draw back. The King, on the contrary, preserved the attitude of a disinterested spectator; on July 11 he said that he was waiting for the Prince's reply.

After the renunciation on July 12, Gramont, having no further ground for demanding a prohibition, wished to obtain from the King a declaration to satisfy French national honour; in the Chamber the belligerent Right announced an interpellation on the securities obtained for the future. The government, therefore, sent Benedetti to the King to say that, as the resignation was not a sufficient reply to the demands and still less a guarantee for the future, the King should promise that he would not allow the Prince to resume the candidacy. However, the council of French ministers refused the mobilization proposed by the minister of war.

The decisive action was taken at Ems on July 13. The King was in the park. Benedetti came in the morning to communicate to him the request for a guarantee. The King replied: "You are asking a promise without limit of time and for all

conditions. I cannot give it." Benedetti insisted; the King replied that he refused this unparalleled demand once for all. Then came a despatch from the Prussian ambassador saying that Napoleon was going to ask the King for a personal letter assuring him that he had had no intention to injure France's interests. William was vexed, and decided not to receive Benedetti again; he sent word to him by his aide-de-camp that the letter from the Prince of Sigmaringen had arrived confirming his withdrawal, and that he regarded the matter as at an end. Benedetti insisted upon an audience; the aide-de-camp replied that the King adhered to the declaration of the morning.

Bismarck, once more in Berlin, irritated by Gramont's declaration and by certain articles in the French newspapers, announced to the English ambassador his intention of demanding explanations and guarantees from France. He received by telegraph an account of the Ems interview, with authorization to communicate it to the press. He also published it immediately in his semi-official organ, the *North German Gazette*, in an abbreviated and precise form which brought out distinctly the King's refusal to reply to Benedetti's demands.*

The article was sent all over Europe, and made war inevitable. It was received in Germany as a patriotic demonstration, in France as an insult. The council of ministers, held on the morning of July 14, had still sought to maintain peace; it thought of Napoleon's favourite plan, a congress of the powers to establish the principle of excluding all members of reigning families from the Spanish throne. Another council, held at St. Cloud, at six o'clock that evening, was still deliberating, when Gramont received and read a despatch which caused an immediate decision in favour of mobilization; this was the news of the insult given to France.† War was announced the next day to the Chamber in

* Bismarck having boasted later of having modified the terms of the note to make war inevitable, the German socialists reproached him with having *falsified* the Ems despatch; and the French press has repeated this accusation. It is enough to compare the two texts to show that there was no falsification. The despatch sent to Bismarck by Abeken in the King's name is in a confidential and obscure form, not suitable for publication, and ends thus: "H. M. leaves it to your excellency to judge if Benedetti's new demand should not be communicated to our ambassador and the press." The note published by Bismarck adds nothing which is not in the despatch; it simply abbreviates it.

† The nature of this insult has always been obscure. German historians confuse it with Bismarck's article on the Ems interview. An oral tradition in French diplomatic circles attributes to King William a phrase which no one would ever dare to publish.

reply to the interpellation on the future guarantees (July 15). The government declared that it had called out the reserves and asked a vote authorizing mobilization. A committee, immediately appointed, listened to a statement by the minister of war, who declared himself ready; Gramont explained the insult and gave the committee to understand that Austria and Italy might be counted on for aid. The Chamber then voted the authorizations. The same day at Berlin, at the news of Gramont's declaration, the King ordered mobilization.

France declared war on the 19th of July.

BIBLIOGRAPHY.

For general bibliography, documents, and works, see chap. xxv. Recollections of diplomats during this period are numerous.

DOCUMENTS.—In addition to the notes, memoirs, and correspondence indicated in chap. xxvi. (*Malmesbury, Stockmar, Martin*), the principal documents are:

For Prussia: *Poschinger*, "Preussen im Bundestag, 1851-59," 1882-84, extracts from the Prussian archives; *Hahn*, "Fürst Bismarck," 5 vols., 1878-91 (see bibl. of chap. xv.); *von Sybel*, "Begründung des Deutschen Reiches" (see below).

For Italy: *Bianchi*, "Storia Docum. della Diplom. Europ.," 8 vols., 1865-72 (see bibl. of chap. xi.); *Mme. Rattazzi*, "Rattazzi and his Time," 1881; *La Marmora*, "Un peu plus de Lumière sur . . . l'Année 1866," trans. from the Italian, 1873.—*Guiccioli*, "Quintino Sella," 1887 (for the period 1867-70).

For France: *D'Harcourt*, "Les Quatre Ministères de Drouyn de Lhuys," 1882 (Austrian alliance party); *L. Thouvenel*, "Nicolas I. et Napoléon III., 1852-54," 1891, "Le Secret de l'Empereur . . . 1860-63," 2 vols., 1889; *Rothan's* series of "Souvenirs Diplomatiques" (see Waitz, "Quellenk.," No. 6356); the author, French consul in Germany, has collected diplomatic traditions; *A. Memor* (pseudo. for Gramont), "L'Allemagne Nouvelle (1863-67)," 1879.

For Austria: *Beust*, "Aus Drei Vierteljahrhunderten," 2 vols., 1887.—*Vitzthum von Eckstatt*, "Sanct-Petersburg und London," 1852-64, 1888; "London, Gastein, und Sadowa, 1864-66," 1889, recollections of an Austrian attaché.

For the Coburgs: *Ernst II. von Sachsen-Coburg-Gotha*, "Aus Meinem Leben . . .," 3 vols., 1887-89.

On the origin of the war of 1870; *Gramont*, "La France et La Prusse . . ." 1872.—*Benedetti*, "Ma Mission en Prusse," 1871; the documents of the *Committee of Inquiry* on the war, 1872; *Revue des Deux Mondes*, 1878, art. by *Prince Napoleon*.—*Lebrun*, "Souvenirs Militaires," 1895; "Aus dem Leben Königs Karls von Rumänien," vol. ii., 1894 (memoirs of the king of Roumania, Charles of Hohenzollern), both of which give details unknown to von Sybel.

WORKS.—COMPLETE HISTORIES.—Coll. Oncken: **Bulle**, "Gesch. des Zweiten Kaiserreiches und d. K. Italien," 1890; **Bamberg**, "Gesch. der Orientalischen Angelegenheit" (from 1856 to 1878), 1892; not enough references in either; **Oncken**, "Zeitalter des K. Wilhelms," 2 vols., 1890-92, more scientific, very Prussian.

H. von Sybel, "Die Begründung des Deutschen Reiches durch Wilhelm I.," 7 vols., 1889-94, stopped at 1870 by the author's death, is the chief work for the outside history; it is hampered by official respect for the Prussian government and attempt at literary style.—**Friedjung**, "Der Kampf um die Vorherrschaft in Deutschland, 1859-66," vol. i., 1897, in course of publication, Austrian.—**Jerrold**, "Life of Napoleon," 4 vols., 1874-82. In addition, the national histories indicated under chap. xxvi., **Walpole**, **Springer**, **Reuchlin**, **Rosen**, and, for France, **Taxile Delord**, "Histoire du Second Empire," 6 vols., 1870.

EPISODES.—Crimean War.—**Geffcken**, "Zur Gesch. des Orientalischen Krieges," 1881; **Kinglake**, "Invasion of the Crimea," 3d edit., 5 vols., 1863, Fr. trans.; "L'Invasion de la Crimée," 2 vols., 1877; **Totleben**, "Défense de Sebastopol," 4 vols., 1863, Russian.

Italian War: "Campagne de . . . Napoléon III. en Italie," 1862, French government publication; "Der Krieg in Italien 1859," 3 vols., 1872-76, Austrian General Staff publication; **Lecomte**, "Relation . . . de la Campagne d'Italie," 2 vols., 1860, Swiss.

War of the Duchies: See **Waitz**, "Quellenkunde," Nos. 6275 to 6286. There are two official histories: "Der Deutsch-Dänische Krieg, 1864," 2 vols., 1886-87, Prussian General Staff; "Den Dansk-Tydske Krieg," 1808 92, Danish Staff-office.

Negotiations between the two wars: **J. Klaczko**, "Les Préliminaires de Sadowa," 1860; **J. Vibort**, "L'Œuvre de M. de Bismarck, 1863-66," 1869.

War of 1866: See **Waitz**, "Quellenkunde," Nos. 6321 to 6347. There are two official histories by the two general staffs: Austrian, 1867-69, Prussian, 1868; in French, **Rustow**, "La Guerre de 1866 en Allemagne et en Italie," 1866; **Lecomte**, "Guerre de la Prusse en 1866," 2 vols., 1868, Swiss; **Crousse**, "Les Luites de l'Autriche en 1866," 3 vols., 1868-70, Belgian trans. from the history of the Austrian General Staff.

Luxemburg affair: **Rothan**, "Souvenirs Diplom.," 1882.

The Council: **Ollivier**, "L'Église et l'État au Concile du Vatican," 2 vols., 1879.

CHAPTER XXVIII.

GERMAN ASCENDENCY AND THE ARMED PEACE.

War with France (1870-71).—France had declared war on Prussia alone. But Prussia had with her as allies outside of the North German Confederation, all the sovereign states of the South. For the first time Germany was fighting unitedly and without foreign aid against France.

England, after offering her mediation, declared her neutrality on July 19. The Tsar, personally related to the King of Prussia and desirous of ridding himself of the treaty of 1856, declared himself neutral, but at the same time made it known that he would intervene against Austria should she support France. With Austria and Italy the French government negotiated until the first defeats; it asked them to prepare for war without officially departing from their neutrality, giving out, meanwhile, that they were arming to prepare for mediation. In Austria, Beust wished to wait; Andrassy, the Hungarian prime minister, caused a decision to be made in favour of neutrality; but Beust did not dare announce it distinctly to the French government; he promised to arrange with Italy for a common mediation.* In Italy, Victor-Emmanuel wanted war, but the ministry felt it impossible

* His letter to the Austrian ambassador at Paris, July 20, contains one of those ambiguous sentences which conform to the traditions of European diplomacy: "Kindly repeat to the Emperor and his ministers that, faithful to the engagements we agreed to in the letters exchanged between the two sovereigns last year, we shall consider the cause of France our own and contribute to the success of her arms to the fullest extent of our power." After having explained that Austria was restrained by Russia, the Hungarians, and Austrian Germans, Beust added: "Under these circumstances, the word *neutrality*, which we pronounce not without regret, is imposed on us by imperious necessity. . . . But this neutrality is only a means . . . toward the accomplishment of our policy, the only means whereby we can complete our armament and avoid exposing ourselves defenceless to a sudden attack." Gramont understood this to be a promise of assistance; it may refer to the agreement made by the three sovereigns in 1869, to conclude no treaty without giving each other notice of it, and may be only a vague promise of mediation.

considering the state of the army and the treasury. It did, nevertheless, negotiate with the French government, but the Roman question hindered any definite agreement. France was therefore left to face Germany alone.

The war was divided into two separate parts by the defeat of Sedan:

I. Both sides wished to take the offensive; mobilization was effected in a fortnight. The Germans, following a plan of campaign prepared in 1868 by von Moltke, intended to "search out the principal force of the enemy and attack it where they found it," on the Metz-Strasburg line. They made no attempt to defend Baden, but centred their forces in the Palatinate. They were divided into three armies, which, once complete, rose to almost 500,000 men. The First army, of 75,000 men, the Second, of over 200,000, marched on Metz by the Sarre, while the Third, of over 150,000 men, mainly from South Germany, under the Crown Prince of Prussia, marched on Strasburg.

The French wished to enter Germany by crossing the Rhine, probably below Rastadt, in such manner as to separate the South Germans from Prussia. They had two armies: the army of the Rhine, the chief army and headed by Napoleon III., on the border of Lorraine on the Sarre, and MacMahon's army in Alsace. But the active army, comprising 750,000 men on paper, in reality only had 250,000; the *garde mobile* of 600,000 men was not organized at all. Mobilization consisted in sending to the frontier regiments as they stood in time of peace, without even waiting to fill up their complement of men. The regiments had scarcely half of their full strength; the army of the Rhine had barely 110,000 men, that of MacMahon but 40,000. Napoleon III. had to give up any idea of offensive warfare. These armies, composed of veteran soldiers, brave and experienced, were ill-supplied with food, ammunition, and field-hospitals, and commanded by officers who had, in Algeria, grown accustomed to irregular warfare, without a definite plan of campaign, without knowledge of the strength and position of the enemy, without topographical knowledge of the territory, and even without maps (they had been given only maps of Germany). They marched slowly and in disorder, the different corps badly mixed together, exposed to sudden attack, without scouts, sometimes even without outposts. It had been almost the same in the Crimean War, but the enemy was then in the same condition. In 1870 the war was between a small army of the old professional kind and

a great, scientifically organized army of the most improved sort. The first campaign divided itself into three acts.

1. The Germans, taking the offensive, attacked both the army of the Rhine and that of Alsace simultaneously (August 6). The army of Alsace, crushed by the Third army at Froeschwiller-Reichshoffen, a confused battle entered upon unintentionally by the Bavarians, evacuated Alsace in disorder and retreated to Châlons. The army of the Rhine, attacked by the First army at Forbach-Spickenen, a height which the Prussians took by storm, fell back on Metz. The results were the abandonment of Alsace, where the Germans had now only to besiege Strasburg, the fall of the Ollivier ministry, the withdrawal of the troops from Rome, and an impression throughout Europe that France was irremediably defeated. Italy, which was still negotiating, decided to remain neutral. She had made a treaty of neutrality with Austria, but remained armed: in order to resist Napoleon's solicitations more easily, she concluded with England a treaty binding both to remain neutral.

2. The three German armies attacked the army of the Rhine, increased to over 150,000 men, and checked its progress by three series of battles, the most disastrous of the war: Borny, in the east, on August 14; Mars-la-Tour, in the southwest, on August 16; and Gravelotte, in the northwest, on August 18. Meanwhile the Second army had surrounded Metz and cut off its retreat. The result was to bottle up the principal French army, which was formed of picked soldiers and was the only body capable of checking the enemy's advance. The Germans left before Metz the First and Second armies joined in one (200,000 men), which shut in the French by a line of intrenchments. The Third German army marched on Châlons; a Fourth army of 75,000 men was left on the Meuse to cut off the French re-enforcements.

3. An army improvised at Châlons from the *débris* of the army of Alsace and re-enforcements of an inferior character, set out under MacMahon to relieve the Metz army. It advanced so slowly that it gave the Third army of Germans time to arrive; stopped by the army of the Meuse, then driven northward, it was surrounded at Sedan, and the whole army, with Napoleon himself, was forced to surrender (September 2). There was no longer a French army. Italy occupied Rome.

II. The second part of the war was longer and more complicated, but much less important from a military standpoint. France, invaded and deprived of her regular army, resisted to

save her honour. The new government of the National Defence improvised armies formed of remnants of regiments, sailors, marines, *mobiles*; it proclaimed a *levée en masse* of all men of twenty-one to forty years of age, and provided some of them with arms bought in England and the United States. This unforeseen resistance astonished the Germans.* But the outcome was never in doubt for a moment, in spite of French illusions. The war was reduced to the siege of Paris and attempts to deliver the city. It was divided into three acts.

1. The Third and Fourth German armies marched on Paris, while the Second blockaded the French army in Metz. The French government sent Thiers, on September 12, to search Europe for alliances. Public opinion, which had been unfavourable to Napoleon, had turned in favour of France against the invading Germans, who had suddenly become too strong; it was shown by manifestations of sympathy and private subscriptions; but no government dared to interfere. J. Favre, in a circular of September 6, announced as the condition of peace: "Not an inch of our territory, not a stone of our fortresses." At the Ferrières interview, on September 19 (see p. 188), Bismarck demanded Alsace; not even an armistice could be arranged. The Germans on the same day took the heights of Châtillon, which enabled them to bombard Paris from the south, and they invested the city. Bazaine, wishing to preserve the Metz army, made no serious attempt to force the blockade, but negotiated with the Germans (see p. 189), and was finally driven by famine to surrender his army, on October 27. On October 31 Russia declared that she no longer considered herself bound by the treaty of 1856 and resumed her liberty of action on the Black Sea. Thiers was sent to arrange a truce (October 31); Bismarck demanded Alsace and \$600,000,000; the negotiation was broken off on December 5, when on the point of completion.†

2. The army of the Loire, formed at Orleans of more than 150,-

* There were, according to Freycinet, "La Guerre en Province," 1871, 230,000 infantry, 32,000 cavalry, 110,000 mobiles, 180,000 militiamen, 30,000 *franc-tireurs* (guerrillas), and 1400 cannon. See the estimate of these forces by a German officer, von der Goltz, "Léon Gambetta and his Armies," 1877.

† Different reasons are given for the rupture: the insurrection of October 31, which made the provisional government fear a revolt in case of a truce; Bismarck's new demands for securities to be taken against Paris, and King William's dissatisfaction over Gambetta's proclamation regarding Bazaine.

ooo men, began, in October, to march on Paris, in spite of the advice of the general, who had no confidence in his improvised troops. It was quickly stopped by the Second German army, which had become disengaged by the taking of Metz, and after a three-days' battle (December 1-3) retreated behind the Loire in disorder. The army created at Paris, chiefly of *mobiles* and national guards, 300,000 in all, attempted to march southward to meet the army of the Loire, but was stopped and driven back to Paris (November 30-December 2).

3. A winter campaign in exceptional cold completed the destruction of the French army. The army of the Loire under Chanzy was attacked by the Second army, and withdrew to le Mans on December 16. The army of the East, under Bourbaki, composed of a part of the army of the Loire, was to march through Franche-Comté to Belfort and force the Germans to retire by threatening their communications in the rear. An army formed in the North under Faidherbe, was to march on Paris. The army of the Loire was put to rout at le Mans January 10-12, the army of the North at St. Quentin January 19; the army of the East, delayed by the cold weather, and stopped by a small but well-intrenched German force (Villersexel, January 9, and Héricourt, January 15-18), was surrounded and took refuge in Switzerland on February 1. Paris, bombarded since December 27, and out of provisions, made a fruitless sortie (Buzenval, January 10); then, on January 24, capitulated.

Treaties of London and Frankfort (1871).—Russia, in denouncing the treaty of 1856, had given just cause for war; England and Austria protested,* England even threatened. But not one of the powers that guaranteed the treaty was in a condition to make war. Bismarck proposed to settle the matter by a conference, in January, 1871. Russia acknowledged the principle that a power has not the right to discard a treaty; but this was only a concession of form. The London Conference annulled the articles that Russia had denounced and on March 13 drew up a new treaty restoring to Russia her freedom on the Black Sea. The Sultan, moreover, accepted this without remonstrance.

* According to the Crown Prince's Journal, King William was greatly displeased with the Russian circular, saying that it was beyond a joke and that he would never again give his hand to Gortschakoff, the author of "this piece of rascality" (*ce coup de Jarnac*). At the Congress of Berlin in 1878, Gortschakoff told how anxious he had been, Russia having no army ready.

Negotiation between France and Germany was divided into three acts.

1. An *armistice* was arranged on January 28, to give time for the election of an assembly to discuss the terms of peace. The army of the East was not included in the truce.

2. The *preliminaries* concluded at Versailles, on February 26, between Bismarck and Thiers, settled the conditions of peace. Bismarck had demanded all of Alsace, including Belfort, a part of Lorraine, and 6,000,000,000 francs. Thiers, by his powers of insistence, retained Belfort and reduced the indemnity to 5,000,000,000 francs. The German army was to enter Paris and remain there until the acceptance of the terms.* The Assembly, by 546 votes against 107, promptly approved the treaty (March 1); the Germans had time to occupy only the Champs-Élysées.

3. Negotiation for the final treaty began at Brussels toward the end of March. The terms of payment for the indemnity, the purchase of railroads in the ceded districts, and commercial relations had still to be settled. The Germans demanded payment in coin, cession of the railroads without compensation, and restoration of the commercial treaties of 1862; no agreement could be made. The Commune arrested negotiations; the Germans remained neutral, but Bismarck spoke in the Reichstag of the necessity of keeping the army ready. Thiers was anxious, and resumed negotiations at Frankfort in May. The treaty of Frankfort of May 20 determined the new frontier, the mode of paying the war indemnity, and the date of German evacuation.

Bismarck consented to buy the railroads from the Eastern Company for 325,000,000 francs (he had at first offered 100,000,000), to accept a partial payment in securities, and renounce the commercial treaty of 1862; but he insisted that the tariff between the two nations should be lowered to the rate of the most favoured nation.†

New Conditions of European Policy since 1871.—The Franco-

*The King had consented not to urge the entrance of the Germans into Paris; Thiers secured Belfort in exchange for the entrance into Paris.

† This was called in France an "industrial Sedan." It was the preservation of the semi-free-trade which had been tried in Europe since 1860 and which France had given up. In reality, as it was impossible to impose by diplomatic means a restriction on the legislation of both countries, the treaty was confined to designating certain nations toward which equality of customs duties must be maintained.

Prussian war overturned European politics. It established the German Empire, that is to say, the unity of Germany under the military predominance of Prussia. It gave Germany an indisputable predominance in Europe. It destroyed the temporal power of the Pope and completed Italian unity. It ended the neutrality of the Black Sea and revived the Eastern question. It destroyed the Napoleonic Empire and established in France the first Republic that has endured. It deprived France of three departments (1000 square miles and more than 1,500,000 inhabitants) and created the *Alsace-Lorraine Question*.

In addition to this, it altered the ideas of European governments and peoples on foreign policy. Universal military service, adopted by all the great states on the continent, in imitation of Germany, has, by making the young men of wealthy families join the army, personally interested the members of the governments and parliaments in avoiding war. The new system of war, with its enormous masses of troops, its invasions, requisitions, complete cessation of business, and new destructive machines, has made war so formidable that all nations wish to avoid it, and so odious that no statesman dares to take the responsibility of beginning it. The representative assemblies, which have become at once more powerful and more democratic, have taken more account of the desires of the peace-loving mass of the nation and have put more pressure on the governments to keep them from war.

The personal will of sovereigns and ministers, which in the preceding period determined the wars, has been paralyzed by public sentiment. The influence of statesmen, although considerable in a number of cases since 1871 (Bismarck, Andrassy, Gortschakoff, Disraeli, and Gladstone), has become less decisive on the outcome of events. It is only in the East, in the countries which have remained outside of the conditions of modern life, with absolute sovereigns and ill-trained armies, that wars and the full sway of diplomatists continue: the international politics of Europe since 1871 has centred in the Balkan Peninsula and its neighbourhood. In civilized Europe, diplomacy, deprived of its only effective means of action, recourse to war, is reduced to a game of demonstrations of sympathy or antipathy. Diplomats continue to make alliances, though deprived of the military sanction; newspapers still gather sensational news from the diplomatic world; the public is kept in continual anxiety; but no great event has come from it.

The German invasion transformed the French idea of war:

they saw it no longer as an "expedition," but an "invasion." The representatives who direct foreign policy know that *in no case* would the great majority of their electors approve an offensive war.

But the treaty of Frankfort, by annexing to Germany Alsace-Lorraine, against the obvious wishes of the inhabitants, created a new question in Europe. In the minds of Frenchmen it presented itself, confused at first, under the popular form of *revenge*. This was the old idea that war is a duel between two nations, in which the vanquished must redeem his honour. This formula gave Germany and possibly Europe the impression that the French protestations against the treaty of Frankfort arose from the same feelings that had prompted the former hatred of the treaties of 1815. It is true that in 1815 only national pride was affected, while the annexation of the people of Alsace-Lorraine *against their will* gave rise to a question of political *justice*. It violated the fundamental principle of democracy. It was impossible for the French to recognise the treaty of Frankfort as legitimate, since it was contrary to the rights of the annexed people. But this watchword of revenge, coupled with a program for the reconquest of Alsace-Lorraine, gave the movement the appearance of a simple territorial claim, founded on national rivalry alone. Even to-day France has not yet learned to let the question rest on the rational ground of the rights of the people. France's representatives, though anxious to maintain peace, have never been able to declare that Frenchmen accept the treaty of 1871, nor to make the real ground of their refusal understood. One point only has been made clear to Europe, which is that France, having become irreconcilably Germany's enemy, is only awaiting an occasion to make war upon her, a policy expressed later by Gambetta's motto: "Think of it always and never speak of it."

As after 1815, European policy has consisted chiefly in maintaining France in peace. Like Austria in 1815, Germany has undertaken this charge. Having nothing further to ask, being, like Austria before, "saturated" (Metternich's expression, revived by Bismarck), she has endeavoured to maintain the *status quo*—that is to say, her own conquests and predominance. But Austria, with her military weakness, had quickly lost her predominance; Germany, with the strongest army in Europe, has kept hers.

The Alliance of the Three Emperors (1871-76).—Bismarck's

aggressive policy in 1864 and 1866, and the annexations of 1864 and 1866, all founded on the right of conquest, had given Europe the impression that Germany was intending, like Napoleon in former years, to use the incontestable superiority of her army to continue her annexations; the conquest of the Germanic countries was next expected, the Netherlands, the German states of Austria, and German Switzerland. The Emperor had announced in a proclamation on January 18, and in a speech from the throne on May 21, that Germany, henceforth united and strong, would strive only to maintain peace in Europe; but these statements were distrusted. For a number of years, the little states neighbouring the Empire, Holland, Belgium, Luxemburg, Switzerland, and Denmark, were in constant anxiety through distrust of the Germans. In actual fact, the German government has since 1871 made neither war nor conquest, nor deserted its peaceful policy.

The other powers recognised German predominance, and the other governments approached Germany with demonstrations of good will and desire for peace. Austria was the first; the creation of the Empire having destroyed all her hopes of ever resuming the first place in Germany, she directed her efforts henceforth toward the Orient (according to Bismarck's advice in 1862), and on this side she needed Germany to counterbalance Russia. The good feeling between Austria and Germany, which has lasted ever since, was shown in 1871 by a series of indications: Beust's address in July to the Austrian and Hungarian Delegations on Austria's friendship with Germany and Italy, which would make central Europe the bulwark of peace,—the Gastein interview between Bismarck and Beust in August,—and the interview between the two Emperors at Salzburg in September. It was consolidated by the fall of Beust in December, 1871 (see p. 538), and the succession to the department of foreign affairs of Andrassy, a Hungarian representative and natural ally of Germany against the Slavs.

In Russia, public opinion, in the Slavic nationalist party and in the official world, was already beginning to manifest itself against Germany. The Tsar, a personal friend of Emperor William, tried to preserve the friendly relations begun in 1863 during the struggle against the Poles. He showed his feelings in a toast to the Emperor in which he recalled the fraternal feeling between the German and Russian armies and the friendship

between the two sovereigns, "the best guarantee for the peace and order of Europe" (December 8, 1871).

Italy, disturbed by the demonstrations of the Catholic party in France for the restoration of the temporal power, began to make overtures to Germany. The movement was emphasized by the visit of the Crown Prince Humbert to the Emperor at Berlin in May, 1872.

The understanding between the powers was shown by the interview between the three Emperors and their ministers at Berlin in September, 1872. Bismarck explained the significance of it: "Europe recognised the German Empire as the bulwark of general peace." This is what was improperly termed "the alliance between the three Emperors"; no treaty was concluded. Other interviews followed: at the Vienna Exposition in 1873,—at Petersburg in 1874,—at Ischl, in the mountains of Austria, in 1874-75,—at Salzburg in 1876,—and in Bohemia in 1875-76. The King of Italy visited Vienna and Berlin in 1873; the two Emperors returned his visit in 1875, but did not go to Rome on account of the Pope; courteous relations were maintained on all sides.

England and France remained outside, isolated in the face of the monarchies of the Centre and East. This peaceful state of affairs lasted until the Eastern troubles in 1876, without other incident * than the rumours of war between France and Germany in April and May, 1875, whose exact history is not known.†

* I do not count the intervention of a German cruiser in the Civil War at Carthegena in 1873, nor the conflict between Germany and Belgium over the declarations of Belgian bishops against Bismarck in 1875.

† These are the undisputed facts. The National Assembly had just voted a law on the organization of the army. The German chief of staff, von Moltke, declared that this law could only mean that France was preparing for another war. The German government instructed its ambassador at Paris, Hohenlohe, to ask an explanation; Hohenlohe presented himself before Decazes, minister of foreign affairs, and said to him: "I am charged by my government to inform you that it regards your armament as a threatening action; will you take note of this?" Decazes refused to take any action, declaring the suspicions unjust. A German semi-official publication, the *Post*, published an article, "War in sight," which discussed the chances of war. About the same time Radowitz went on a special mission from Germany to the Tsar. The rumour spread through the whole diplomatic world of Europe that France was threatened with war; Decazes asked help from Orloff, the Russian ambassador, and declared that if the French were attacked they would retreat behind the Loire. An article in the *Times* said that the Prussian military party

Eastern Affairs (1875-76).—After France's defeat, Russia had gained a ruling influence over the Turkish government. She secured the creation of a *Bulgarian Exarchy* which removed the religious direction of the Orthodox Bulgarians from the Greek Patriarch of Constantinople in order to give it to a Slavic prelate, a *protégé* of Russia. The Slavic nationalist party in Russia founded a Society for the Deliverance of the Slavs, directed by a central committee and sub-committees. This society excited the Christian Slavs in Bosnia and Bulgaria and worked in communication with Russian consular agents.*

The Orthodox Servians of Herzegovina finally revolted, in July, 1875, which reopened the Eastern question. Andrassy's note (see p. 631) enumerated the guarantees to be demanded of the Turks in order to restore peace; the note was not in collective form for fear of offending the Sultan.

But the insurgents demanded reforms which the Porte refused to declare war, march on Paris, and claim new millions. In Russia, Chancellor Gortschakoff, informed of this by the French ambassador Leflô, replied: "Be strong! You are too rich not to excite envy." Leflô obtained an audience of the Tsar, told him of his fears, and asked if he would shield France with his sword. The Tsar replied that his word would be enough, that he would go to Berlin and there express his wish for the maintenance of peace. On May 11 the Tsar saw the Emperor at Berlin, and the rumours of war ceased at once. Some time after, Emperor William said to the French ambassador that the rumours of war had arisen from manœuvres on the Stock Exchange; and to the French military attaché he said: "It was a plot to make trouble between us." Bismarck, in the Reichstag in February, 1886, declared that the papers busied themselves too much with foreign affairs.

These facts have been given two interpretations. Gortschakoff let it be understood, and Ambassador Gontaut-Biron said, that Prussia had decided on war, and sent Radowitz to sound the Tsar's opinion; also that had it not been for the Tsar's intervention Prussia would have attacked France. This opinion seems to have been that of most European diplomatists. Bismarck, on the other hand, has declared that neither he nor the Emperor desired war, which would have been "a colossal piece of stupidity"; that this whole incident was a plot between Gortschakoff and Gontaut-Biron, both his personal enemies, to annoy him and to set themselves up as guardians of peace; that they had made use of Radowitz' mission and the Tsar's visit to Berlin, which Gortschakoff knew beforehand, to make people believe there had been a design of war on foot and that the Tsar had arrested it.

*This secret action was revealed by letters which the Turkish government procured in 1872, and published in 1877, with the suppression of proper names. It is a matter of opinion, whether the Russian agents worked by order of their government or without its knowledge.

fused; they then drove back the Turkish army with the aid of the Montenegrins (April, 1876). The Sultan, threatened by Russia, dared not declare war on Montenegro; but he sent an army to the frontier. The Prince of Montenegro openly declared war. Then animosity against the Turks grew so strong that the war party got possession of the power in Servia and Roumania and the Bulgarians revolted. Meanwhile the assassination of the German and French consuls by the Mussulmans at Salonica obliged the powers to intervene. The concert of Europe was counted on to force the Porte to grant reforms that would put an end to the trouble. But the Disraeli ministry, resuming the traditional English policy of defending the Ottoman Empire against Russia, refused to be bound by the Berlin Memorandum, in which the other powers concurred. England sent her fleet independently to the neighbourhood of Constantinople, giving the Turks the impression that she was supporting them.

Servia declared war; small Servian armies, composed of militiamen, entered Turkish territory in July; they were quickly thrown back into Servia. The Tsar, the declared protector of Servia, had Russian volunteers enrolled and spoke publicly of a war "perhaps near at hand"; finally, in November, he demanded of the Turks a truce of two months. Then, Disraeli having made a threatening speech in England, the Tsar began to mobilize his army (November). He nevertheless got England to agree to a conference at Constantinople, formed of the ambassadors of the six powers; a plan of reforms was drawn up, but the Turkish government refused to accept it.

The powers recalled their ambassadors in January, 1877, and Russia succeeded in persuading the other powers to sign the London protocol, by which she promised to disarm if the Sultan would agree to make the promised reforms (see p. 632). The Porte having refused this protocol, Russia announced that, all the reform projects having received an unqualified rejection from the Porte, her interests forced her to put an end to the disturbances. Alexander II., in spite of his desire for peace, had finally yielded to the nationalist party, which, under Aksakoff, had for two years been conducting a press campaign to induce the government to go to the aid of their Slavic brethren oppressed by Turkey.

The Turkish War (1877-78).—All the European powers declared neutrality; England protested in the name of the treaties, but added that she would not interfere unless to protect her

own interests, the Suez Canal, Constantinople, and the Dardanelles.

Russia, besides Montenegro, which was still at war, had as an ally Roumania. This nominally Turkish principality having failed to obtain Turkey's consent to neutrality, preferred to join hands with Russia, and offered her the right of passage for her army on condition that Russia should guarantee her territorial integrity.

The war consisted of four operations.

1. The Russian army entered Roumania in April and slowly crossed the Danube in May and June, in spite of the Turkish fleet; it made use of the Roumanian supplies, but refused the help of her army.

2. The Russian army invaded Bulgaria, and, leaving the quadrilateral of Turkish fortresses, marched on the Balkans; the advance guard, under Gourko, surprised and took the Shipka pass, tried to descend on the other side and was driven back, but retained possession of the pass. The Turkish army intrenched itself in Plevna, at the intersection of the principal highroads of Bulgaria, and repulsed two attacks (July). The Russian army saw itself compelled to conduct a regular siege, and asked the aid of the Roumanian army.

3. The siege of Plevna was long and bloody (September-December). The Turkish soldiers, mainly Albanians, having got rid of their officers and divided themselves into small groups, sheltered by intrenchments, with good Martini and Snyder guns and unlimited cartridges from the Plevna arsenal, defended themselves with stubborn courage and killed many of the enemy (16,000 Russians, 5000 Roumanians). The Russian army was poorly supplied and had no intrenching tools. They had to wait for re-enforcements to surround the place; they finally inclosed it in October, in order to starve it into surrender. A Turkish army came to relieve the place, but was beaten off. The famished Plevna army issued from its intrenchments, made an attack, was surrounded, and capitulated on December 10. Servia, which had long been armed, declared war anew.

4. The Russian army, in spite of snow and cold, crossed the Balkans, forced the passes, surrounded and captured a Turkish army in the mountains, then descended through the valley of the Maritza upon Philipopolis, where it put the last Turkish army to flight, January 14 to 17, 1878. The Russians then marched to Adrianople.

Peace of San Stefano and Congress of Berlin (1878).—The Sultan, left without an army, sent a request for peace, declaring himself at the mercy of the Tsar's generosity; Russia set forth her conditions in the Adrianople protocol, on January 31: independence and enlargement of Roumania, Servia, Montenegro, a principality of Bulgaria, and autonomy for Bosnia. England was disturbed and prepared her fleet (January 28), then sent her vessels into the Dardanelles against the Sultan's wishes. Russia replied to this demonstration by declaring that she considered herself free to occupy Constantinople (February). A provisional agreement prevented a conflict. As the Turkish government was trying to prolong negotiations, Grand-Duke Nicholas transferred his headquarters to San Stefano; there the Russian plenipotentiary, Ignatieff, communicated his ultimatum. The *preliminaries* of San Stefano, March 3, 1878, concluded the peace on the bases of the protocol of January 31 (see p. 633).

Russia had worked exclusively in the interests of her Slavic *protégés*. The English government replied with warlike demonstrations, but hesitated to engage in a conflict in which no other power would follow her. Russia was exhausted and wanted peace. The Russian and English governments finally agreed on the questions to be discussed in a European congress. To counterbalance Russia's acquisitions in Asia, England concluded a secret treaty with the Sultan on June 4, promising, if the Russian annexations should be maintained, to defend Asia Minor; the Sultan in return promised reforms in those countries and authorized England to occupy Cyprus.

The Congress of Berlin, composed of the ministers and ambassadors of the six great powers (Russia, Germany, Austria, England, France, and Italy), and of the Sultan, met in June, 1878, under the presidency of Bismarck. It showed Germany's predominance in Europe. Bismarck had declared that he would accept the rôle, not of arbiter, but of an "honest courtier" to aid in the restoration of peace.

The congress settled all the questions that had been brought up in the Ottoman Empire by insurrections and wars. All the powers were agreed on Austria's occupation of Bosnia, and imposed it on the Turks. Their disagreements arose concerning Bulgaria, Asia Minor, and the Danube. In the case of Bulgaria, the powers obliged Russia to yield (see p. 665). England protested, as a matter of form, against Russia's annexations in Asia Minor, and took the opportunity to publish the secret treaty

which gave her Cyprus. On the Danube question, Austria compelled Russia to accept neutralization and the destruction of fortresses.

The congress also discussed the case of Greece and forced Servia and Roumania to grant political equality to the Jews.

Formation of the Triple Alliance (1879-83).—The settlement of the Eastern question at Berlin had broken the understanding between the Empires. Gortschakoff could not forgive Bismarck for not having supported Russia's demands. Austria, mistress of Bosnia, endeavoured to increase her influence with the Christians of the Balkan Peninsula and to open for herself a commercial route through Salonica. These objects brought her into competition with Russia. The discord was marked by articles against Germany in the Russian papers and Russian military activity on the Austrian frontier. Bismarck approached Austria more closely to support her against Russia in the East. Austria concluded secretly with the German Empire, in October, 1879, "an alliance for peace and mutual defence," designed especially in case of an "attack on either by Russia"; for in the case of an attack by any other power, the states promised each other only a friendly neutrality, unless the aggressor should be supported by Russia.

Alexander's personal friendship for William kept up the official appearance of harmony; there were still interviews between the Emperors in 1879, and in March, 1880, a toast was proposed by Alexander "to his best friend, William." But the Russian government was making military preparations in Poland as if for a Western war. It allowed the newspapers to agitate in favour of France and against Germany. The idea of an understanding between France and Russia, which had been suggested several times prior to 1830 (by Napoleon, Richelieu, and Polignac), but had been abandoned for half a century because of the indignation caused by Russian policy in Poland, began to be talked of once more. France was eager to find an ally against Germany, and Russia was irritated by German predominance. An alliance was proposed in an interview with Gortschakoff by a French journalist (of the *Soleil*) in September, 1879; later the same idea appears in Gambetta's declarations and in the speeches of the Russian general, Skobeleff, in 1882.

The Eastern question had destroyed the understanding between the Eastern monarchies and prepared a new grouping. Colonial policy completed this evolution. France, abandoning

her "policy of recollection," sought new conquests in Asia and Africa. She thus put herself in conflict with Italy. Italy since 1870 had been hesitating between distrust of France, which she suspected of wishing to restore the temporal power, and hostility to Austria, which controlled the Italian Tyrol and Trieste. She pursued the "policy of free hands," avoiding all engagements in order to keep herself free to seize any opportunities that might arise. After the triumph of the French Republicans in 1877 she was inclined to approach France and support the *Irredentists*. The conquest of Tunis suddenly changed her attitude; she broke with France, renounced *irredentism*, and approached Austria; the King paid a visit to the Emperor in October, 1881.

England, on the succession of the Liberal ministry in 1880, changed her Eastern policy. Gladstone, who openly hated the Turks, sided with Montenegro and Greece (see pp. 663 and 634).

The death of Alexander II., in 1881, completed the destruction of the understanding between the three Emperors. Alexander III. was personally hostile to German influence. But being determined to maintain peace above everything, he took a peaceful minister of foreign affairs, de Giers (1882), and continued the traditional interviews between the Emperors; in Germany in 1881 and 1884, and in Austria in 1885.

The Italian government, probably to consolidate the monarchy, asked to be admitted to the defensive alliance between Germany and Austria. Thus was concluded, in 1883, the *Triple Alliance*, designed to maintain peace by a coalition of three European powers against the supposed warlike designs of France and Russia. French opinion would put no faith in the purely defensive and consequently peaceful character of the Triple Alliance. France steadily regarded it as a threat of war.

Formation of the Franco-Russian Understanding.—The Triple Alliance at first seemed to be a centre for all the monarchical states: the Kings of Roumania, Servia, and Spain looked to Germany. England, contesting with France for Egypt and Indo-China and with Russia for Afghanistan, made advances to Italy. Even the Tsar, in his desire to maintain peace in Afghanistan, concluded a secret convention* by which Russia and Germany mutually promised a friendly neutrality in case one or the other

*This was not known until October, 1896, when Bismarck's semi-official journal gave the sense, but not the text; it seems to have had a war with England in view.

should be attacked. This was agreed on at an interview between the three Emperors at Skiernevice, in September, 1884. France, isolated and busy with her colonial enterprises, resigned herself to making terms with Germany for the regulation of African affairs (Conference of Berlin, 1884-85).

Once again it was the Eastern question that brought a change in European politics. The Roumelian revolution in 1885 (see p. 667) obliged the powers to take sides. They all began by declaring void the union with Bulgaria, as contrary to the treaty of 1878. But Austria finally protected Bulgaria. Bismarck, without officially recognising Ferdinand, refused to interfere actively in an affair which did not interest Germany. (He said that it was not worth the bones of a single Pomeranian grenadier.)

Alexander III., who had become hostile to the Bulgarians, was annoyed at the action of Germany and Austria. Russian opinion used the opportunity to show its hatred of Germany (1886-87).^{*} This agitation coincided with the agitation caused in France by certain incidents on the German frontier † and the campaign of the *League of Patriots*. In both countries war with Germany and an alliance began to be talked of, in 1887. Bismarck replied to these demonstrations, whose practical significance might be a matter for discussion, by publishing in February, 1888, the treaty of alliance made with Austria in 1879 and by increasing Germany's active army. There was no rupture with Russia, as had been expected, for the treaty of neutrality of 1884 lasted until 1890. But the German creditors got rid of Russian government bonds, and the impression got abroad that the Triple Alliance was growing stronger, while France and Russia held aloof from each other. Boulanger's defeat calmed the agitation in France. Alexander III. held to his policy of peace and confined himself to the expression of his dissatisfaction by the toast to the Prince of Montenegro in 1889, "To Russia's only sincere and faithful friend." But after the fall of Bismarck

^{*} Katkoff's articles against Bismarck in 1886; declarations against Austria by the Russian superior officers (in the *Daily News*);—interview with Ignatieff by a Servian journalist;—Prince Nicholas' toast at Dunkirk in October, 1887.

† Arrest of a French commissary of police, Schnæbelé, on the Frontier in April, 1887; the German government released him. The motive of the arrest has never been made clear.—The Raon incident, in September, 1887: a hunter killed on French territory by a German soldier; Germany paid an indemnity.

the German government refused to renew the treaty with Russia, which expired in 1890,* and displeased the Tsar by effecting a reconciliation with the Poles in Posen (see p. 506).

England, directed since 1886 by Salisbury's conservative ministry, inclined toward the monarchies of the Triple Alliance. This harmony was marked by the cession to the German Empire of the little German island of Heligoland, which had been held by England since the days of the Continental Blockade. This was a tribute to national feelings which Germany requited by concessions in eastern Africa in 1890.†

But the Tsar had finally decided to make open advances to France. He showed this by public acts. A French squadron sent into the Baltic was solemnly received at Kronstadt; the Tsar ordered the *Marseillaise* to be played, and listened to it standing. He sent the President of the Republic a telegram in which he spoke of the "profound sympathies that unite France and Russia" (July, 1891). A Russian loan was opened in France and covered by French subscribers. The visit which the Tsar was to make to the Emperor of Germany was delayed and reduced to his passing a few hours in Kiel, on his return from a stay in Denmark (June, 1892). A Russian squadron came in October, 1893, to Toulon, whence it sent a detachment to Paris; it was received with much celebration and honour. The Tsar and the President exchanged telegrams; the Tsar spoke of the "bonds that unite the two countries." French opinion assumed that Russia and France were united by a formal alliance. In any case it was evident that there existed at least a Franco-Russian understanding; the exact nature of this understanding remained a secret. England replied with a demonstration of friendship for Italy; an English squadron visited Italy in 1893.

European policy was henceforth dominated by stubborn opposition between the Triple Alliance of central Europe and the Franco-Russian league. Both having the same declared object, the maintenance of peace, their opposition has produced the

* This change in policy is known only through the revelations made in October, 1896, by the *Hamburger Nachrichten*, which attributes it to the influence of England, which was supposed to have been threatened by the treaty of 1884.

† The International Conference for the study of legislation for the protection of the labouring men, proposed by Switzerland in 1889, and at Emperor William's request held at Berlin under his own presidency, produced no practical result (March, 1890).

same practical effect as a general understanding. But Russia, certain of France's support in any case, has acquired a sort of predominance in the affairs of the East and the extreme East. After the Chinese war, she intervened with France, drawing in Germany, which did not wish to be left alone, to force Japan to make peace.

When the Eastern question was reopened by the Armenian massacres, Russia and England seemed to have exchanged their traditional attitudes. England proposed that Europe should intervene to impose on the Sultan certain reforms in favour of his Christian subjects; and it was Russia that took the Sultan's part against intervention and reforms.* With France's support, Russia paralyzed England. Austria and Germany, to avoid complications in the East, adhered to Russia's policy; and the European concert of 1895-96 took no effective step in the Sultan's affairs. Russia, having regained her influence in Bulgaria (see p. 669) and shut out European intervention from the Ottoman Empire, seems to have resumed her sway in the Balkan Peninsula. She has consolidated the Franco-Russian understanding by Nicholas' visit to Paris in October, 1896, which gave the impression of a complete alliance between the two countries. German predominance in the West is counterbalanced by Russia's predominance in the East; this is the new form of European balance of power.

Armed Peace.—Since the completion of German and Italian unity within a quarter of a century, there has been in all Europe—except the semi-barbaric Balkan countries—no war, either large or small. It is the first time that Europe has lived through so long a period of absolute peace. But this peace covers a permanent hostility. Between Germany and France there is conflict over the Alsace-Lorraine question, which is still confused in French minds, but is produced by an irreconcilable opposition between two conflicting conceptions of right: sovereignty of the government by right of conquest, the principle of the German monarchy; sovereignty of the people, whence arises the right of every population to determine its nationality, the principle of the French democracy. Between Austria and Russia it is the old conflict over the Eastern question, under the form of a struggle for influence in the Balkan countries.

The fear of war, which has become much more horrible than

* This policy is explained by a remark attributed to the Russian ambassador: "We do not wish to have Armenia made a second Bulgaria."

in former times, acts as a check on hostile feelings. All the nations have conceived such a horror of war that the governments no longer dare even to use a threat of it to carry out their policy. All are agreed to adopt, as the fundamental rule of their policy, the maintenance of peace.

But these unanimous expressions of desire for peace are not enough to reassure the public mind; for fifteen years it has been announced that there must be war the next spring. National distrust is so deep rooted that each people refuses to trust its neighbour's sincerity and takes its protestations of peace as a manoeuvre designed to quiet the suspicions of some nation about to be attacked. Now in modern warfare mobilization is so rapid, and the advantage of the offensive so decisive, that, to have a chance to resist, each country must hold itself always ready for war.* The rapid progress in the art of warfare obliges each state, in order to keep up with the rest, to make over her war material often and increase the number of her soldiers. The effective force of armies in time of peace is to-day equal to the former effective force in time of war. The account of Europe's military expenditure has often been made out; but as yet no one is able to estimate the deficit in production caused by the time lost in military service. The economic danger to Europe has often been pointed out, in competition with America and Asia, which are exempt from these charges. An International Peace League has proposed that the nations shall disarm, and make war impossible by accepting the principle of arbitration between states. This campaign has produced no effect on the governments except in America and Norway. In Europe it encounters mutual distrust of the nations and the difficulty pointed out by Bismarck in 1870, of securing an effective disarmament with the short-term system of military service. No government has accepted the solution proposed by the French Republicans of 1867, to shorten the service to a period sufficient to make the army a national militia as in Switzerland. The German reform of two-year service for infantry (see p. 509), which seemed a step in this direction, was only an expedient to increase the effective force in case of war. Europe lives in peace, but it is armed peace, peace with the burdens of war, and without security.

* Bismarck clearly explained this situation in two addresses to the Reichstag on the military law (January 11, 1887; February 6, 1888).

BIBLIOGRAPHY.

See p. 811, the bibliography of documents and works on the whole external history.

BIBLIOGRAPHY.—**Waitz**, "*Quellenkunde* . . .," stops at 1888. For history since 1870 the most reliable process is gleanings from the periodic bibliographies indicated in **Ch.-V. Langlois**, "*Manual of Histor. Bibliog.*," 1896.

DOCUMENTS.—Besides the "*Staatsarchiv*" (see preface, p. xii.), the principal publications for this period are the official collections of diplomatic documents presented by the governments to the Chambers of the different countries (blue books, yellow books, etc.), and for the war of 1870-71, "*L'Enquête Parlementaire de l'Assemblée Nationale*," and **Angeberg**, "*Recueil des traités et piéces diplomatiques concernant la Guerre Franco-Allemande*," 5 vols., 1873. Recollections, notes, and correspondence are rare and of little importance, except for the French war (see bibl. in **Lorenz**, "*Catalogue de la Libr. Franç.*"). The best sources of information are the "*Annual Register*," the "*Geschichtskalender*," and the reviews (indicated in the bibl. of the different countries).

WORKS.—**COMPLETE HISTORIES:** **C. Bulle**, "*Gesch. der N. Z.*," 4 vols., 1886 (see pref., p. xii.), stops at 1885.—**Oncken**, "*Das Zeitalter des Kaisers Wilhelm*," 2 vols., 1890-92, stops at 1888 (coll. Oncken), scientific popularization, very German, fairly well provided with references, may serve as bibl. for the question of the rumours of war in 1875.—**Hippeau**, "*Hist. Diplomat. de la 3^e Republique*," 1888.

EASTERN AFFAIRS: **Bamberg**, "*Gesch. der Orientalischen Angelegenheit* . . ." 1892 (coll. Oncken), goes to the peace of Berlin, very few references.

EPISODES: Franco-Prussian War (see **Waitz**, "*Quellenkunde*," Nos. 6369-6430): "*Der Deutsch-Französische Krieg*," by the German General Staff, 5 vols., 1878-81, Fr. trans. by Costa da Serda; "*La Guerre Franco-Allemande de 1870-71*," 20 vols., 1873-82; the leading technical history.—**Chuquet**, "*La Guerre de 1870-71*," 1895, the handiest and most reliable history of the whole.—**Valfrey**, "*Hist. du Traité de Francfort* . . .," 2 vols., 1874-75.—**Sorel**, "*Hist. Diplom. de la Guerre Franco-Allem.*," 2 vols., 1875.

Eastern wars (see "*Catal. de la Bibliothèque du Dépôt de la Guerre*"), **Rustow**, "*Der Krieg in der Türkei*," 1877; "*Der Orientalische Krieg* . . ." 1877.—**Lecomte**, "*La Guerre d'Orient en 1876-77*," 2 vols., 1878-79.

CONCLUSION.

POLITICAL EVOLUTION OF EUROPE.

THE nineteenth century has brought all the nations of Europe more profound and more rapid changes than any other period in the history of the world. Every state has since 1814 changed its political or social organization. In almost*all* this evolution has been accompanied, if not produced, by revolutions and civil wars, and in several by nationalist wars. The nineteenth century has been a time of internal revolutions. On the other hand, compared to preceding centuries it has been a time of European peace;—forty years, 1814 to 1854, without a great war,—a quarter of a century, since 1870, without any war except in the East; between the two, only fifteen years of great wars, 1854-70.† These revolutions and wars were very unevenly distributed. Almost all have concentrated themselves upon short periods of agitation, 1820-23, 1830-35, 1847-50, 1859-70, separated by longer periods of calm.

Contemporary history begins with a general reaction against revolutionary France and Napoleon, the restitution of the territory they had conquered and the restoration of the governments they had destroyed. All over Europe the political power was restored to the hereditary sovereigns, supported by the aristocracy. In almost all the states the Prince and his ministers governed as absolute masters, without a constitution, without a representative assembly, without control. Certain states (England, France, the Netherlands, Switzerland, South German States, Sweden, Norway, Poland, and Hungary), had an elective representation, based on property, with guarantees against arbitrary rule; but everywhere, even in England, the assembly was practically subordinated to the ministers.

The prevailing system of Continental Europe in 1814 was, as in the eighteenth century, the personal government of the

*The only states that have not had revolutions are England, Russia, and Sweden.

†There remain outside of these periods only Eastern wars: 1828, 1854, 1877, almost foreign to the general evolution of Europe.

Prince, aided by his officials; some southern countries had even the rule of the *camarilla*. The landed aristocracy, which was still richer than the rising industrial aristocracy, held its economic power, social supremacy, influence with the sovereign, and, in the countries with assemblies, the electoral power; it shared the direction of the nation with the officials. The army, recruited by voluntary enlistment or compulsory draft, was not a national force, but a controlling instrument at the service of the sovereign. The clergy, subordinated to the lay power, had lost, except in the southern countries, its former ecclesiastical power; it had become everywhere a body of state office-holders.

This system was upheld by a coalition of all the bodies in possession of power. An official alliance obliged the governments of all the great states to maintain the settlements of territory made in 1815; the Austrian government, through Metternich's influence, directed the common policy and sought to extend the guarantee of the *status quo* to the domestic system of all the states, so as to prevent any political change in Europe. In each country a tacit coalition between the sovereign, the office-holders, the aristocracy, the clergy, and the army laboured to maintain the political system.

In the face of this all-powerful coalition, the opposition forces included only the middle class (few in numbers and often dependent), the people of certain large cities, the youth in the schools, a number of journalists, and in countries subjected to dismemberment or to foreign rule, the nationalist patriots. These malcontents, without means of political influence, material force, or even common leadership, seemed powerless against the great weight of conservative forces. In every country, the mass of the nation, the peasants and the lower middle class, were inert and unaccustomed to political life in any form; they added no force to the opposition.

This apparently firm system did not, however, endure a half-century. This was because the revolutionary period had not left merely memories and regrets; it had formed a militant staff of agitators which, grouping the malcontents of every description into liberal and nationalist parties, conducted a perpetual warfare against the work of the Restoration. Their means were violent: plots, city riots, military revolts, and nationalist insurrections. The governments replied with prosecutions, condemnations, executions, and a system of political persecution—intermittent in France and central Europe, continuous in the

South. But they opposed to their adversaries only small and poorly equipped armies and a clumsy police. The revolutionists also profited by the discord between the defenders of established order, hereditary nobles and upper middle class, clergy and office-holders, army officers and court, and especially national hatreds and rivalry between states.

Everywhere the struggle was over the same fundamental questions of political life: to what organ the sovereign power belonged *by right*, what set of men should exercise it *in fact*? This is why party division has seemed the same in all civilized countries. Excluding the nationalist parties and omitting the personal coteries and special groups, there remained four great parties, constituted everywhere on almost the same plan and with the same programs:

1. The *absolutist* conservative party, formed by the high officials and landed aristocracy, desired to maintain absolute government, clerical authority, and censorship of the press; it controlled all the central, eastern, and southern states of Europe. It no longer existed in England; the former absolutist party, the *Jacobites*, had not survived a century of political liberty.* It never existed in the Netherlands or in Sweden and Norway; in France it was never alone in power.

2. The liberal conservative or *constitutional* party, Tory and Right Centre, composed of the upper middle class and the liberal office-holders, demanded that the assembly should control the administration of the government, particularly in financial matters. Its ideal was personal government by the sovereign with a parliament of two houses, one aristocratic, the other elective; an electoral body limited by a considerable property qualification; the parliament to vote the annual budget, but to leave the Prince free in the choice of his ministers and in the direction of general policy; no censorship, but a liberty of the press restricted to the wealthy classes; the nation's rights guaranteed by a constitution. This party was in power in the constitutional states; in the absolute monarchies it demanded a constitution, a representative assembly, and abolition of censorship.

3. The *parliamentary* liberal party, Whig and Left Centre, recruited in the middle class, demanded not only control for the elected assembly, but its supremacy over the sovereign, the min-

* This is one cause of the peaceful character of England's evolution and of the small number of parties (improperly called classification into two parties).

isters, and the aristocratic chamber. Its ideal was the parliamentary system, a ministry chosen from the party in majority in the house, governing in the Prince's name, but according to the will of the elective representatives of the nation; a constitution recognising the superior rights or sovereignty of the people, political liberties (press, public meeting, and association), and absolute religious liberty. As a material guarantee, it demanded, on the continent, a national guard, that is, an armed middle class, to defend its political rights. It would admit only property-owners to the vote, but tended to lower the qualification in order to admit to the voting body the lower middle classes. This party, shut out of power by the Restoration, did not begin to gain it until 1830.

4. The democratic or radical party, formed by students, workmen, writers, and lawyers, demanded, according to the motto of the French Revolution, sovereignty and political equality of the people. It added to the demands of the parliamentary party universal suffrage and pay for representatives, abolition of all political privileges for the wealthy classes, and separation of Church and state. Its ideal was a purely representative democratic and preferably republican government like that of the French Convention, or even a direct government in which the people should make the constitution. In 1815 this party, so far from being in power in any country, had not even the right to formulate its program publicly except in England, Sweden, and Norway.

The two extreme parties, absolutist and democratic, had the two diametrically opposite conceptions of government and society. The absolutists wanted a society based on *hereditary inequality*, a government based on the *absolute sovereignty of the Prince*, all authority concentrated in a personal sovereign and *descending* by delegation, with *compulsory religion*. The democrats admitted neither political heredity nor ecclesiastical authority; they demanded social *equality*, authority *ascending* by delegation of citizens, a purely lay state, and *sovereignty of the people*. A country might, however, pass from one of these extremes to the other by gradual evolution, for the four parties formed a continuous gradation. The absolutist system became constitutional when the Prince consented to grant a constitution, as in the German states from 1816 to 1819. The constitutional system was insensibly transformed into the parliamentary system, as the sovereign took more account of the wishes of the elective chamber,

as in England after 1830. The parliamentary system became democratic with the extension of suffrage and the assembly's acquisition of an irresistible supremacy over all the other powers, as in Switzerland. Now, the enlargement of the electoral body was to be made by a series of transitions; the transition of the "sovereignty of the prince" into that of the people, inconceivable in theory, was to be accomplished by slow increase in parliamentary influence, which imperceptibly transformed its controlling influence into absolute rule. It is by this evolution that the word *control* has come to mean *rule*.

This gradation has made possible coalitions between neighbouring parties. The natural tendency of parties was to join forces against the party in power: the absolutist system was opposed by the coalition of the three liberal parties; the constitutional system by the coalition of parliamentarians and democrats. The instinctive policy of the extreme parties was to take shelter behind the nearest government party, in order to advance a step together. The French liberals cried: "Long live the Charter!" the English radicals supported Whig reforms, the German and Italian democrats demanded constitutions. The opposition was always, even in England, rather a coalition than a coherent party.

England and France, provided with a constitution, a parliament, and a political press, were model states to the liberals and furnished the doctrines for all Europe. The struggle against the governments began in England with the Radicals' unsuccessful reform campaign, 1816-19; in France, after 1816, with the cry for electoral reform, and in Germany with the university movements. Later it took the form of armed revolutions in Spain, Portugal, Naples, and Sardinia, in the name of sovereignty of the people. The allied governments crushed these armed revolutions in short wars, and used the opportunity to formulate the doctrine of intervention against revolution (1820-23).

The absolutists' triumph was short-lived. The alliance between the governments, shaken by conflicts over the questions left unsettled in 1815,—namely, Spanish colonies and the Ottoman Empire,—was broken up by the revolution of 1830. This revolution was the work of the small democratic republican party in Paris, which took advantage of the parliamentary conflict with Charles X. to rise in insurrection. The movement of 1830 set up in France the doctrine of the sovereignty of the people, a

parliamentary system controlled by the property owners, the political power of the national guard, and liberty of the press. A parallel but peaceful evolution established in England, by the Reform Bill of 1832, the full-blown parliamentary system, a truly representative house and an extended suffrage. The French and English system, which had become the ideal of the parliamentary parties in other countries, was introduced into Belgium in 1831 by a nationalist revolution, aided by the governments of France and England. A parallel movement in Switzerland overturned the defenceless Conservative ruling class, and gave the democratic representative system to the great "regenerated" cantons.

In Italy the movement was a failure. In eastern Europe it led to the destruction of the Polish nation and its constitutional system. In France the democratic party, in its endeavour to renew the revolution, was destroyed by its former ally, the parliamentary party. In the Iberian countries, two successive quarrels over the succession ended in introducing constitutional forms and parties copied from other countries, but the army remained the real political power.

Europe was divided into two regions: the eastern and the central states remained absolutist, the West had become parliamentary. The former alliance was cut into two leagues: on the one hand, France and England, which worked in unison until the Eastern affair of 1840, and on the other the coalition of the three autocratic monarchies. Revolutions in Switzerland continued until the defeat of the Sonderbund Catholics and the adoption of the federal constitution of 1848, which established democratic republican government all over Switzerland. In England this was a time of great agitations, political, industrial, Chartist, and Irish,—huge peaceful demonstrations which failed to accomplish any reform. The rest of Europe was almost stationary from 1835 to 1847, and France fell back toward a personal constitutional government.

This calm was the decisive period of preparation for the parties and ideas which filled the remainder of the century. Two new parties were formed, of an international character: the Catholic party and the Socialist (communist) party, sprung from the former political parties, but no longer regarding politics as anything but a means of carrying into effect a general scheme of religious and social reorganization. The Catholic party, including the mass of conservatives, especially the peasants, who had

hitherto been inert, laboured to restore the public authority of the Church. The socialist party, recruited among the democrats, demanded universal suffrage, but only as a means of accomplishing a *social* revolution. At the same time nationalist parties were forming all over central Europe—Austria, Germany, and Italy. Founded as they were on hatred of foreigners and on community of language, incorrectly termed *race*, they attracted together patriots of all kinds, from the aristocratic monarchists to the democratic republicans. But they joined the political opposition parties against the governments and became revolutionists.

The revolution of 1848 in France, carried through by a socialist party working in the shelter of the democratic and parliamentary parties, brought into power a coalition of democrats and socialists which, at a single stroke, established in France the complete democratic system: a republic, universal suffrage, a sovereign elective assembly, a popular national guard, liberty of the press by the abolition of financial restrictions, and freedom of political clubs. The first attempts at socialistic reform, the right to employment and national workshops, which the socialist minority imposed, disappeared in the suppression of the socialist insurrection of June.

The French revolution set the example for a general democratic movement in central Europe; the governments, alarmed by the sudden agitation and overestimating the practical power of the revolutionists, either let the popular revolution proceed or resigned themselves to making one in their own name. The Kingdom of the Netherlands passed from a constitutional to a parliamentary system, Denmark from an absolutist to a constitutional system. In Germany, both in Prussia and in Austria, the revolution produced new democratic forms, universal suffrage, equality before the law, a constituent assembly, popular publications and clubs, without touching the monarchy or the army. It was combined with a nationalist movement for German unity which hesitated between two forms: a democratic federation or an empire under the King of Prussia. In the Austrian Empire, the revolution was democratic in Austria proper, but nationalist in the Magyar, Slav, and Italian sections. In Italy the Kingdom of Sardinia adopted the constitutional system, with a very extended suffrage, and took the direction of the nationalist movement against Austria; the democratic republicans in 1849 established republics in central Italy.

The reaction was brought about by the armies, which were still intact and at the sovereign's service; they crushed the democratic party in the large cities. Begun by the Emperor of Austria, with the aid of the Slavs, against the Germans and Magyars, continued by the King of Prussia, first in his own kingdom, then in Germany, it was completed in Italy by foreign armies, in Hungary with the aid of the Russian army, in Germany by the Tsar's threats, and in the duchies in 1850 by European intervention. In France a domestic reaction brought a Napoleon to the executive power, then the Catholic conservative party to the legislative power; after having worked together against the democratic party they entered into a conflict with each other, which ended in the Empire; France fell back into the military absolutist system. Spain, under constitutional forms, returned to personal government.

The governments, having learned a lesson from revolution, organized an alliance of all conservative forces, including the bourgeoisie, which was disturbed by the socialist movement, and the Pope, who was alarmed by the Roman Republic. The repressive measures taken against the revolutionary parties and their instruments, the press and public meetings, deprived all the parties of political power, even the parliamentarians. The absolutist system then extended all over Europe, except Switzerland and the countries which had remained outside of the revolution of 1848, England, Belgium, Holland, and Norway. The absolutist calm reigned ten years, interrupted only in Spain by a local revolution in 1854, which restored the constitutional system.

But the revolution of 1848 left a change in three states: in France, universal suffrage and the official doctrine of the sovereignty of the people; in Prussia, the Constitution of 1850, which, from its Belgian model and its revolutionary origin, retained the theory of liberties and an almost universal suffrage; in Sardinia the *Statuto* of 1848, which established semi-parliamentary government, an almost democratic property qualification, and the system of the lay state. Further, the unsuccessful attempts at national unity had left in Sardinia the desire to accomplish Italian unity, in Prussia the desire to accomplish German unity, and Napoleon, formerly a revolutionist, remained personally in favour of the "policy of nationality." Napoleon first joined England, checked the Tsar, and took the opportunity afforded by the settlement of the Eastern question to sketch the national Roumanian state and bring up the Italian question. Then the

three revolutionary governments combined against Austria, the conservative power that was hindering the unity of Italy and Germany. In 1859 Napoleon, with his army, aided Sardinia to begin the Italian union, by beginning to drive Austria out of Italy; in 1866, by his neutrality, he helped Prussia to begin the German union by driving Austria out of Germany. Both unions were completed by the defeat of France in 1870.

The first nationalist war in 1859 ended the reactionary period. The absolutist system, which had been in practice since 1849, was no longer defended in theory; the educated public still disapproved of the French idea of democratic revolution, but it was permeated with English liberalism and enamoured of *self-government* and aristocratic representative institutions. Within ten years there came all over Europe, aided by the governments, a revival of liberalism which produced a general transformation in political institutions. From these peaceful revolutions has resulted the Europe of to-day.

England, by the electoral reform of 1867, succeeded to a democratic parliamentary system. France, by a series of concessions from the Emperor, secured a constitutional government approaching the parliamentary system, almost liberal and completely democratic.

Austria, under the pressure of financial distress, adopted a constitutional system with an aristocratic suffrage, "the representation of interests." She then went through a crisis of conflicts between the predominating Germans, who wished to preserve the centralized system, and the subordinate nationalities, Magyars, Czechs, Poles, and Slovenians, who joined the old-*régime* parties, aristocracy and clergy, in the demand for federalism. The final settlement was accomplished by separation into two states united toward foreign nations: Hungary, which revived the aristocratic parliamentary system established during the revolution of 1848; Austria, which retained the centralized constitutional system, with ascendancy of the German element and a withdrawal of power from the clergy.

In Prussia, after long conflict with the parliamentary party, the conservative ministry, from 1862 to 1866, took advantage of its military victories to establish, as a compromise, a military constitutional system which left the ruling power to the King and his ministers. In Germany, it established, in 1867, the union under a common constitutional government with democratic suffrage, monarchical-democratic military service on the Prussian

model, and the sovereignty of the King of Prussia and the Chancellor. The creation of the Empire in 1871 brought all the German states into this union. Each preserved its constitutional system, government by officials under more or less control by assemblies elected on a semi-democratic suffrage.

Italy, where the way for national unity was prepared by agreement between the revolutionary government of Sardinia and the republicans, was created by successive annexations of all the Italian states to the kingdom of Sardinia—annexations effected with the formal consent of the inhabitants and in spite of the Pope's protests. She preserved her constitutional system, which, thanks to the abstention of the Catholic conservatives, developed into a parliamentary and democratic system under the direction of the Southern Radicals.

Even Russia, which had hitherto kept out of the political evolution, was transformed by the reforms of Alexander II., freedom of the serfs, creation of local assemblies, and liberal reforms in justice and press which prepared the way for a Russian nation and the formation of a public opinion to serve as a check on the Tsar's personal government. The Poles, encouraged by the feeling through Europe, attempted a nationalist and democratic insurrection; but the European governments dared not give them armed support. The movement was put down in the name of the unity of the Slavic race. In the midst of a general evolution toward liberty, Poland returned to a system of national and religious repression.

Denmark, separated from the duchies by the war, finally issued from the constitutional crisis begun in 1848, adopting, in 1866, a constitutional democratic system with the effective power vested in the King, as was shown by the constitutional conflict from 1886 to 1892. Sweden transformed her old assembly of estates into a modern parliament, and entered upon the democratic constitutional system.

The new Christian states detached from the Ottoman Empire were transformed by European example. Greece, by a revolution in 1862, completed the change from the constitutional system to the democratic parliamentary system with a single house (Greece having no aristocracy). Roumania also got rid of her personal government by a revolution in 1866 and entered upon an almost parliamentary and still aristocratic system. Servia, a nation of peasants, still under the personal system, received, during a regency, a democratic monarchical constitution.

Spain, owing to a military revolution in 1868, began a rapid evolution, which brought her out of a lay parliamentary monarchy with universal suffrage into a federalist democratic republic after the American pattern; a military restoration in 1874 brought her back to a constitutional monarchy, ruled by the ministry and clergy.

Switzerland, by a series of cantonal revisions, organized the first experiment in direct legislation by the whole body of citizens.

The absolutist system, eliminated from central Europe, confined itself to the two Eastern empires—taking in Russia the form of a bureaucratic monarchy, in the Ottoman Empire the form of personal despotism. After having been, in 1815 and in 1852, the universal system, it has come to be an outgrown survival. The liberal system became the normal government in Europe, under democratic parliamentary form in the west, and constitutional form in the centre. The governments themselves summoned the liberal parties to share the power. Under this system of political liberty the democratic parties were reconstituted: in France a radical republican party, in Italy a radical party supporting the monarchy, in Germany a socialist party, in the Scandinavian countries a peasants' party.

The two international parties, Catholic and Socialist, reappeared in the struggle. The Catholic party, once more thrown on the defensive by the new lay policy of the governments, affirmed its resistance to revolution in 1864 by protests from the Pope against the Kingdom of Italy and against modern liberties. It engaged in a general conflict with the governments concerning the rights of the Church, losing ground everywhere except in Belgium, but bracing itself to maintain the political struggle. The Socialist party, reconstituted by the survivors of 1848, after an attempt at international association, took the form of national parties organized under a permanent management with a socialist democratic program. It took this course first in Germany, where it occupied the place of a radical party, then in the other countries.

Meanwhile the balance of power in Europe was overturned by war.

Prussia, hitherto a secondary power, had preserved from her wars against Napoleon, a monarchical-democratic military service, which, combined with intelligent tactics and perfected arma-

ment, gave her military supremacy in Germany in 1866, in Europe in 1870.

The war of 1870 ended the crisis of nationalist wars. Germany, supreme in Europe, has obliged the other states to adopt her military system and has put a stop to war by making it horrible. By annexing Alsace-Lorraine, she created between herself and France a permanent hostility which reduces the whole foreign policy of Europe to a game of diplomatic combinations for the preservation of peace. All warlike action has related to the Orient and has been practically outside of Europe. The jealousy of the European powers has prevented a rational solution of the Eastern question. The Turkish problem has, however, been getting gradually, if incompletely, solved by the formation of Christian states. These, under political forms borrowed from Europe, are still agitated by the rivalry for influence among the powers and by the conflict between European civilization and national tradition.

War has ceased. The perfect police system and the vast military power of the governments have made revolutions impossible. Each state has therefore remained steadfast in the form of government it had when the military transformation took place; the governments, taking heart from their power, have stopped the evolution from the constitutional to the parliamentary system. France alone was able to overthrow the Empire, which had lost its armies, and has established a democratic parliamentary system in which, after long conflict with the Catholic monarchical parties, the Radical party acquired control in 1879, and is slowly paving the way for direct representative government. The other states have preserved their former system, parliamentary in the west, constitutional in the centre.

The nationalist parties in central Europe, Germany, Italy, and Hungary, have weakened the opposition by going over to the support of the new national governments. But the internal evolution, though slower, has continued peacefully, and the political parties have undergone a gradual transformation which has led them little by little toward democracy. The governments have abandoned the absolutist system; the conservative party has been obliged to follow them and has slipped into the place left by the liberal constitutional party. The parliamentary party, unable to support restricted suffrage, has approached the democratic pro-

gram. The two intermediary parties of the liberal middle class have thus been almost entirely absorbed, the constitutional into the conservative party, the parliamentary into the democratic party. Norway has profited by its lack of an army and by its revolutionary Constitution of 1814, to force the King to accept a democratic parliamentary system. In England, the Liberals, disorganized by their alliance with the Irish party, have been merged with the Radicals. In Belgium the old liberal party, faithful to the plan of a property qualification for voting, was swept away after the establishment of universal suffrage, which was extorted from the Chambers by the threat of a revolution by the workingmen. In France, Italy, and Germany the former parliamentary parties, being unable to sustain electoral competition with the democratic radical parties, have been reduced to mere remnants. Europe has now practically but two parties, conservative and democratic, but these are much farther apart than the parties so named in 1815. The evolution which has brought the conservatives on the old liberal platform has also pushed the liberals toward democracy. Bismarck and William II., Disraeli, Napoleon III., and the Count of Paris have given the new watchword of "democratic monarchy," whose ideal is the personal government of the sovereign resting on the traditional devotion of the people. Permanent harmony between the prince who directs the nation's policy and the subjects who ratify his acts, is to be maintained by universal suffrage.

The two international parties, Catholic and socialist, have taken a permanent place in political life and begun to leaven with their principles the old political parties. The conservative party tends to lose itself in the Catholic party or to ally itself with it in the Protestant countries, in order to restore the conservative power of the Church. The democratic party is impregnated with socialistic ideas and, in the countries where its own program is exhausted, tends to replenish it with plans of social reform.

All parties thus tend, as in Belgium, to concentrate into two masses, one conservative, the other democratic, both of which tend to draw their theoretic inspiration from the doctrines of the two extreme wings, for which politics is but a means. Now these two extremes show in their doctrine, and apply with logical vigour in their own organization, two radically opposed conceptions which they strive to introduce into political life: the Church remains faithful to the absolutist tradition of sovereign

authority emanating from above and exercised by chiefs invested with sacred authority; the socialists, according to democratic principles, admit only an authority delegated from below to chosen mandatories. But the practical direction of political life rests everywhere with the intermediary parties, parliamentarians or liberal conservatives, business parties, occupied with practical affairs rather than with doctrine. These intermediary parties, deadening the shock between two opposite conceptions, maintain, in the midst of ardent polemics, a social peace and liberty which Europe has never known before.

A natural tendency to attribute great effects to great causes leads us to explain political evolution, like geological evolution, by deep and continuous forces, more far-reaching than individual actions. The history of the nineteenth century accords ill with this idea.

England, Norway, and Sweden alone have gone through a regular political evolution, produced by continuous internal development. The rest of Europe, from 1814 to 1870, suffered sudden crises caused by sudden events: 1. The revolution of 1830, which destroyed the European alliance against revolution, implanted the parliamentary system in the West and prepared the field for the rise of the Catholic and socialist parties; 2. the revolution of 1848, which brought universal suffrage into general practice, prepared the way for the national unity of central Europe, and organized the socialist and Catholic parties; 3. the war of 1870, which created the German Empire, made it supreme in Europe, destroyed the temporal power of the Pope, changed the character of warfare, and established the system of armed peace.

The revolution of 1830 was the work of a group of obscure republicans, aided by the blunders of Charles X. The revolution of 1848 was the work of certain democratic and socialist agitators, aided by Louis Philippe's sudden lack of nerve. The war of 1870 was the personal work of Bismarck, prepared by Napoleon III.'s personal policy. For these three unforeseen facts no general cause can be discerned in the intellectual, economic, or political condition of the continent of Europe. It was three accidents that determined the political evolution of modern Europe.

INDEX.

- Abdul-Aziz, Sultan of Ottoman Empire, 628; popular dissatisfaction with, 631; struggle with "Young Turkey," 631; deposed, 631.
- Abdul-Hamid, Sultan of Ottoman Empire, 631; personal government of, 634; religious head, 635; Panislamism, 635; English and German influence, 635; turns to France and Russia, 636.
- Abdul-Medjid, Sultan of Ottoman Empire, 623; interested in reforms, 625; reform edict, 626; death, 628.
- Aberdeen, English prime minister, 43, footnote; Spanish marriages, 776; Eastern Question, 784; Crimean War, 789.
- Adrianople, peace of, 761.
- Adullamites, 64; disappear, 69.
- Agronomic Society (Poland), 597.
- Aix-la-Chapelle, Congress of, 748, 752.
- Albania, revolt of, 634; chronic agitation, 635.
- Albert, Austrian Archduke, 806.
- Alexander (Karageorgewitch), prince of Servia, 658; unpopularity of, 659; deposed, 659.
- Alexander, King of Servia, 662; *coups-d'état*, 663.
- Alexander, Prince of Bulgaria, 666; *coup-d'état*, 666; military *coup-d'état*, 668; abdicates, 668.
- Alexander I., Prince of Roumania, 643; conflict with Assembly, 643; *coup-d'état*, 643; forced to abdicate, 644.
- Alexander I., Tsar of Russia, attitude toward Bourbon restoration in France, 103; opposes restoration in Switzerland, 259; sends aid to King of Sardinia, 332; government, 582; death, 585; policy toward Free Masons, 719; Holy Alliance, 748; character and policy, 750; liberal interests, 750; rivalry with Metternich, 750; Eastern policy, 752; conversion to absolutism, 752.
- Alexander, II., Tsar of Russia, 590; liberal tendencies, 590; first reforms, 591; liberal reforms, 596; return to absolutism, 603; Karakosof's attempt against, 606; Terrorists' attempts against, 608; death, 608; peaceful policy, 788, 821.
- Alexander III., Tsar of Russia, 608; death, 613.
- Ali, Ottoman reformer, 628; death, 630.
- Allies, formation and policy, 1; treaty of Paris, 5; permanent agreement, 5; restore the Bourbons in France, 103; armies withdraw from France, 105; defeat Napoleon at Waterloo, 113; restore the Bourbons once more under changed conditions, 113; unite again against France on the Eastern question, 144, 389, 774; settle the Belgian question (London Conference), 237; questions in 1815, 747; Holy Alliance, 748; French policy, 752; break up of Alliance, 761, 762; Quadruple Alliance, 770; Cracow affair, 776; end of European concert, 785.
- Alma, battle of, 790.
- Alphonso XII., Isabella abdicates in his favour, 312; attains his majority and declares in favour of constitutional monarchy, 315; recognized King, 315; his government, 317; dies, 318.
- Alsace-Lorraine, taken by Germany, 482; government, 510; church, 511; parties, 512; Statthalter Manteuffel, 513; *Alsace-Lorraine question*, 819, 831. See also under Germany, 510.

Anarchists, 735.
 Andrassy, Austrian prime minister, 538; attitude in Franco-Prussian War, 813.
 Andrassy Note, 630, 823.
 Anglican Church, 18; disestablished and disendowed in Ireland, 71; disestablishment proposed by Chamberlain, 84; place of, in evolution of 19th century, 99.
 Anglo-Russian Protocol, 760.
 Anti-Corn-Law League (England), 57.
 Atpwerp, siege of, 238; Convention of, 248.
 Aosta, Amadéo, Duke of, accepts Spanish crown, 311; opposed by Republicans, Carlists, Unionists, patriots, and finally clergy, 311; his government, 312; abdicates, 313.
 Arcadiens, 180.
 Armed Peace, 831.
 Armenian Massacre, 636.
 Arndt, in nationalist agitation, 394; dismissed, 435; pardoned, 438.
 Arnim, Count von, 496.
 Artois, Charles, Count of, see Charles X.
 Aspromonte, Garibaldi's second expedition checked at, 357.
 Auersperg, Austrian prime minister, 534; second ministry, 538.
 Augustenburg, Frederick, Duke of, Schleswig-Holstein Crisis, 467, 798. See also under Denmark, 571.
 Aurelian, Roumanian prime minister, 648.
 Austria, in settlements of 1815, 4; compensations for loss of Netherlands and Swabia, 6; mixed population of, 8; power in Italy, 328; undertakes to crush the Naples rebellion, 331; the revolution of 1848, 341; the Italian war, 351, 793; in Germanic confederation, 375; government, 378; absolutism, 380, 382; territorial questions affecting new constitution, 394; Great Germany party, 394; shut out of German Empire and breaks with Frankfort Parliament, 395; Frankfort Conference, 397; Dresden Conference, 398; reestablishment of old confederation, 398; directs Diet, 398; condition in 1814, 401; German predominance, 403; Metternich's system, 403; *Josephism*, 406; no public interest in politics, 406; national opposition in Hungary, 406; *dualism*, 406;

Austria—Continued.

Hungarian constitution, 406; national opposition in Slavie countries, 409; Liberal German opposition, 411; weakening of Metternich system, 411; Cracow Republic, 412; revolution of 1848, 413; Metternich resigns, 413; Academic Legion and Central Committee for Defence of Popular Rights, 413; Emperor flees, 413; Archduke John forms new ministry, 414; Assembly of 1840 and its work, 414; Hungary granted independent government, 414; Slavie revolution, 414; Panslavic Congress, 415; breaks with Hungarian revolutionists, 417; uses Slavs against Magyars, 417; Lambert's nomination, 417; Viennese troops march on Hungary, 417; Vienna campaign, 418; absolutist system restored, 418; aristocratic system restored, 421; Concordat of 1855, 422; fall of Josephism, 422; political life ceases, 423; financial disorder, 423; remains outside Zollverein, 454; Bismarck's diplomacy toward, 467; induced to join Bismarck, 468; takes Holstein (Gastein Convention), 469; confederation dissolved, 470; Austro-Prussian War, 470, 801; treaty of Prague, 472; Emperor recognises "hereditary abuses," 518; reinforced council, 518; parties, 519; "historic rights," 520; Constitution of October, 1860, 520; Constitution of '61, 521; distribution of seats in House of Representatives, 522; attempt at unitary government, 522; national resistance in Hungary and Venetia, 523; Hungary's demands, 524; Croats, Czechs, and Poles withdraw from Reichsrath, 524; constitution suspended, 525; Emperor restores dualism and negotiates with Hungary, 525; Hungarian compromise, 526; *Cisleithania*, 526; government under the Union, 527; Liberal constitutions of 1867, 528; distribution of seats in Reichsrath, 529; footnote; political conditions, 529; race complications, 530; proportion of races in Empire, 531; political and national parties, 531; government of Liberals, 534; religious laws, 535; conflict between Church and State, 535; financial and military reorganization, 535;

Austria—*Continued.*

Slavic nationalist movements, 536; attempt at federalist constitution, 537; opposition withdraws from Reichsrath, 537; electoral reform, 538; distribution of seats, 539; constitutional ministries, 540; "May Laws," 540; political clubs, 540; liberal program, 542; condition of army, 542; national unity agitation, 543; Bosnia crisis, 543; Slavic agitation, 544; Emperor deserts constitutional party, 544; negotiation with Czechs, 544; balance of parties upset, 545; federalist policy of Taaffe ministry, 545; Germans unite, 546; Czech evolution, 547; Germans and Poles unite, 548; electoral reform of 1896, 548, 549; political evolution in nineteenth century, 552; Polish insurrection, 600; Austria in Holy Alliance, 748; Polish question, 768; intervention in Italy, 768; Münchengraetz interview, 770; absolutist alliance, 771; Italian affair, 777; Swiss affair, 777; restoration after revolution of '48, 780; refugees, 781; triumphs over Prussia, 781; recognition of French Empire, 783; reduced to defensive policy, 788; severs diplomatic relations with Sardinia, 793; Zurich treaty, 796; connection with Polish affairs, 797; Italy and Prussia unite against, 800; policy, 800; interview between Emperor and Napoleon, 804; Napoleon proposes triple alliance, 805; Franco-Prussian War, 813; alliance of three Emperors, 821; Austria's part in Berlin Congress, 826; Triple Alliance formed, 827; armed peace, 831; share in political evolution of Europe, 842.

Austro-Prussian War, 470, 801.

Baden, constitution under Germanic Confederation, 379; political revival, 387; decrees of 1832, 388; revolution of 1848, 390; Republican rising, 396; supports Prussia in the union agitation, 466; joins Austria against Prussia, 471; supported by Russia, 751.

Baden, Articles of, condemned by Pope, 265.

Badeni, Austrian prime minister, 549.

Bakounine, in Panslavic Congress,

Bakounine—*Continued.*

415; on repression of Polish nationalist movement, 600; brings socialism into Russia, 606; the International, 730; contest with Marx, 730; founds Anarchist party, 735.

Balkan Peninsula, condition of nations in 1814, 638; centre of international politics since 1871, 819.

Balta-Liman treaty, 642.

Banffy, Austrian prime minister, 550.

Barbès, French Republican, 139; Socialist leader, 163.

Barcelona, burning of monasteries and massacre of monks by Spanish Progressists, 299; revolt of Progressists, 303; Republican party proclaims a republic, 303; bombarded by Espartero, 303; revolt of working men, 307.

Basque provinces, position in the Spanish monarchy, 300; government, 300; support Don Carlos, 300; make peace with the government for maintenance of privileges, 303; in second Carlist war, 314; condition regulated by Constitution of 1876, 316.

Bavaria, Constitution under Germanic Confederation, 379; political revival, 387; revolution of 1848, 390; King rejects election of Prussian King as Emperor, 395; Zollverein, 454; joins Austria against Prussia, 471, 783; concordat with Pope, 690; supported by Russia, 751.

Bazaine, French general, 189, 816.

Beaconsfield, see *Disraeli*.

Belcredi, Austrian prime minister, 526.

Belgian Railroad Purchase, 805.

Belgium, formation of Kingdom of the Netherlands, 229; social conditions in 1814, 229; effects of French occupation, 229; neutrality, 230; government under Fundamental Law, 230; opposition to Dutch government, 230; Doctrinal Judgment, 231; Catholic Liberal Union, 233; Revolution of 1830, 234, 762; Belgian Congress, 234; independent Kingdom founded, 234; Leopold of Coburg chosen King, 235; settlements of London Conference, 237, 766; siege of Antwerp, 238; parties, 244; financial crisis, 245; Education Act of 1842, 245; Liberal Alliance, 246; struggles between Catholics

Belgium—*Continued.*

and Liberals, 246; Popes condemn constitution, 248; Liberals in power, 248; revolution of '48, 248; Antwerp Convention, 248; "Young Liberals" or Progressists, and Doctrinaires, 249; army question, 249; bishops support Pope, 250; Liberal Federation, 250; School Law, 250; universal suffrage established, 252; attempts to reconstitute Liberal Union, Orban and Janson, 253; Democratic demonstrations, 253; Nyssen's project, 254; present political parties, 255.

Belleville Program, 182, 183.

Bem, 419.

Benedetti, 809.

Beresford, English general, establishes dictatorship in Portugal, 319; refused admittance on return from Brazil, 320

Berg, Danish Democratic leader, 575.

Berlin, peace of, 661.

Berlin, Conference of, 396, 782; memorandum, 632, 824; Treaty of, 770.

Berlin, Congress of, 826; Disraeli takes part in, 76; Austria invited to occupy Bosnia and Herzegovina, 544; dismemberment of Ottoman Empire, 634; compensation for Roumania, 647; settlement of Bulgaria, 665.

Bermudez Zea, Spanish absolutist minister under Christina, 296.

Bernadotte, see *Charles XIV. of Sweden.*

Berri, Duc de, assassination of, 121, 755.

Berryer, leader of Legitimists (France), 166; the deficit, 177.

Bessarabia, restored to Moldavia, 642; taken by Russia, 646.

Beust, von, Austrian prime minister, 526; fall of, 538; foreign policy, 805; in Franco-Prussian War, 813.

Biarritz interview, 800.

Bismarck, Prussian prime minister, interview with Favre at Ferrières, 189; report on Frankfort Diet, 398; first ministry, 461; policy, 461; House protests against foreign policy, 464; plan for union, 466; duchies crisis, 466; diplomacy, 467; induces Austria to join him, 468; modifies his policy, 480; economic reforms, 480; Guelph Fund, 481; Customs Parliament, 481; govern-

Bismarck—*Continued.*

ment as Chancellor of Empire, 489; joins National Liberals against Catholics, 491; *Culturkampf*, 492; attempt to assassinate, 493; "Bismarck's party," 494; military, penal, and press laws, 495; Liberal reforms, 495; financial measures, Imperial Bank established, 495; Count von Arnim agitation, 495; Bleichroeder Era, 496; struggle against Socialists, 497; economic and social policy, 498; Economic Council, 500; coalition of Conservatives and Catholics, 501; colonial policy, 501; Army Law, 502; Cartel, 502; importance to William I., 502; beginning of movement against, 503; Frederick's diary, 503; continues to govern under William II., 504; rupture with Emperor, 505; resigns, 505; war against Caprivi, 508; trip to Vienna, 508; Alsace-Lorraine, 510; leads European policy, 789; Biarritz interview, 799; alliance with Italy, 800; Austro-Prussian war, 801; secret interview with Napoleon, 803; declaration of Franco-Prussian war, 807; London and Frankfort treaties, 817; interviews of three Emperors, 822.

Black Sea, declared neutral, 792; Russia regains freedom in, 817.

Blanc, Louis, French Socialist, 141; theory of national workshops, 141; draws up program of Democratic party, 150; in the provisional government of the Republic, 159; rights of labour, 160; national workshops established by decree of provisional government, 160; outbreak by clubs, 163; "Days of June," 163; socialistic schools, 722.

Blanqui, French Republican, organizes insurrection, 139; Socialist leader, 163; Commune of Paris, 188.

Bleichroeder Era, 496.

Bohemia, Czech national opposition to Austrian rule, 410; *Panslavism*, 410; revolution of 1848, 414; *Panslavic Congress*, 415; centre of Czech national movement, 532; demand for personal union, 536; Austria negotiates with, 544; Czechs unite against Germans, 545; agitations, 545; evolution of Czechs, 547.

Bordeaux, Compact of, 190.

- Börne, 387.
 Bosnia Crisis, 543. See also under *Ottoman Empire*, 634.
 Bosphorus, Strait of, opened, 620; Straits Convention, 623.
 Boulanger Crisis, 213, 829.
 Bourgeois, French prime minister (Radical), 220; program, 220.
 Brandenburg, Duke of, Prussian prime minister, 446.
 Bratiano, Roumanian prime minister, 645.
 Bravo, Gonzalez, Spanish minister, 309.
 Bresson (Spanish marriages), 304, 775.
 Bright, John, Radical leader, heads free trade movement, 58; his program, 70.
 Brisson, French prime minister, 213; candidate for presidency, 220.
 Broglie, French minister, press law of 1819, 120; unites with Republicans against Charles' government, 127; party of resistance, 134; minister under MacMahon, 197; "Moral Order" government, 197; ministry defeated, 201; second ministry, 206; resigns, 207.
 Brunswick, constitution granted, 387; action on Zollverein, 454.
 Buffet, French prime minister, parliamentary influence, 181; president of National Assembly, 197; forms ministry, 201.
 Bukovina, centre of Roumanian national movement, 532.
 Bulgaria, revolt of peasants, 631, 665; insurrection put down by Bashibazouks, Bulgarian atrocities, 631, 665; Congress of Berlin, 634; Bulgarian people before 1885, 664; Church affairs, 665; constitution of 1869, 665; Alexander of Battenberg chosen prince, 666; parties, 666; *coup d'état*, 666; protest against Russians, 667; union with Roumelia, 667; conditions since union, 667; political transformation, 667; struggle for the union, 668; Europe imposes peace, 668; military *coup d'état*, 668; Ferdinand of Coburg chosen prince, 669; attempts of Russian party against Stambouloff, 669; Ferdinand recognized by Sultan, 669; revision of constitution, 669; Stambouloff assassinated, 669; reconciled with Russia, 669; Macedonian agitation, 669.
 Bull of 1814, 689.
 Bulwer (Spanish marriages), 304, 775.
 Burschenschaft, 383, 385.
 Cabral, Costa, leader of Portuguese Chartists, 322.
 Cabrera, Carlist general, 302; continues the Carlist war in Catalonia after peace is made, 303.
 Cadiz, siege of, 294, 759.
 Cairoli, Italian prime minister, 365.
 Camarilla of Spain, restored in 1815, 290; succeeded by a ministry, 298; forms again about Christina, and governs without ministerial control, 305; under Isabella, 308.
 Campos, Martinez, proclaims the Spanish restoration of 1874 by *pronunciamiento*, 315; makes terms of peace with Cuban insurgents, 316, footnote; unites with Sagasta in the government, 318.
 Canning, detaches England from Holy Alliance, 30; prime minister, 33; favours Catholic emancipation, 33; English policy under, 759; at Congress of Verona, 759; death, 760.
 Canning, Stratford, 784.
 Canovas del Castillo, Spanish minister under Alphonso XII., 315; leader of Conservative party, 317; abandoned by the king in conversion of the debt, 318; restored, and fights against Republican press, 318.
 Canrobert, French general in Crimean war, 790; Italian war, 795.
 Cantonists, revolt of (Spain), 313.
 Capodistrias, head of Greek government, 652; despotism, 652; assassinated, 652.
 Caprivi, German Chancellor, 505; resigns Prussian prime ministership, 508; Bismarck's opposition, 508; disputes with Eulenberg, 509; resigns chancellorship, 509; policy in Alsace-Lorraine, 514.
 Carbonari, organization and aims, 329; persecution, 331; uprising in Naples, 334; struggle against Pope, 692.
 Carignano, Charles Albert, prince of, part in the Sardinian rebellion, 332; appointed regent by Victor Emmanuel, 332; succeeds to throne of Sardinia, 332; his motto, 337; *Re Tentenna*, 338; conflict with Austria,

Carignano—*Continued.*

338; his reforms, 339; grants the Constitutional Statute, 340; revolution of 1848, 340; begins national war again in 1849, 344; abdicates, 344.

Carlier, 167.

Carlists, composition of the party, 296; *Carlists* and *Christinos*, 297; the Carlist war, 300; Carlist army and tactics, 301; division of the party, 302; end of this war, 303; gradually abandoned by the absolutists, 305; revolt for the defence "of religion," 307; declare themselves in favour of "the national kingship" and "unity of faith," in 1868, 311; led by the priests, revolt against Serrano's regency, 311; revolt against Amadeo, 312; repetition of first Carlist war under the Republic, 314; Carlist army forced to take refuge in France, 315; end of second Carlist war, 316; present condition of party, 317.

Carlsbad Decrees, 385.

Carniola, centre of Slovenian national movement, 532.

Carnot, president of French Republic, 214; assassinated, 219.

Carrel, Armand, 128, 140.

Cartel, 502.

Casimir-Perier, French prime minister, party of resistance, 134; policy of his ministry, 136.

Casimir-Perier, prime minister and president of French Republic, 220; personal quarrel with socialists, 220; resigns, 220.

Castelar, Spanish minister and orator under the Republic, 313; president of Spanish Republic, 314; his system of military dictatorship, 314; resigns, 314; leader of Possibilists, 318.

Catalonian Junta, 293.

Catholic Church, condition before French Revolution, 684; Toleration and Parity, 686; the Revolution in the Church, 687; "enlightened despotism," 688; Concordat of 1801 and organic articles, 688; restoration of, 689; Bull of 1814, 689; transformation of, 691; Ultramontane party, 691; evolution of French national church, 691; government of Rome, 692; Liberal Catholic

Catholic Church—*Continued.*

party, 692; *Mirari Vos*, 693; Catholic Democracy, 694; revolution of 1848, 696; reaction, 696; *Nostis et Nobiscum*, 696; Josephism abandoned, 697; Concordat of 1855, 697; doctrine of Immaculate Conception proclaimed, 698; *Quanta Cura*, 699; Syllabus, 701; Vatican Council, 704; doctrine of Infallibility adopted, 706; Anti-infallibilists, 705; Inopportunists, 705; *Pastor Aeternus* Bull, 706 footnote; separation of Church and State in Italy, 707; Church of Old Catholics formed, 707; law of Papal guarantees, 708; Austria abrogates Concordat of 1855, 708; Peter's Pence, 710; Leo XIII. elected, 710; his encyclicals, 711; his policy, 714; *Culturkampf*, 714; Leo XIII. interferes in domestic policy, 715; encyclical for Catholic union, 716; new powers of, 716.

Catholic Emancipation (England), 32.

Catholic Liberals, Belgian Union of, 233; demands of the party, 692; in Ireland, 693; in Belgium, 693.

Cavaignac, Godefroy, 129; formation of Communist Socialist party, 140; invested with dictatorial power by Constituent Assembly, 163; candidate for presidency, 165.

Cavour, Italian minister, favours revolution of 1848, 341; description of, 348; his policy, 349; agreement of Plombières, 351; Roman question, 357; September Convention, 357; death, 359; foreign policy, 788; leads European policy, 789; makes alliance with Napoleon, 793.

Chamberlain, Radical leader, 84; proposes disestablishment of Anglican Church, 84; leader of Liberal Unionists in House of Commons, 98; government's man of action, 98.

Chambord, Count of, birth secures Bourbon succession, 122; recognised by Right as Henry V., 199.

Changarnier, 168.

Charbonnerie, in revolutionary agitation, 122; "four sergeants of Rochelle," 122; organization of, 719.

Charles Albert, King of Sardinia, see under *Carignano*.

Charles I., prince of Roumania, 644; builds up army, 646.

Charles X., Bourbon restoration, 104, 105; Beugnot on the return of, 112;

Charles X.—*Continued.*

the *Entresol* ministry, 112; flees to Belgium in the Hundred Days, 113; second restoration, 113; leader of Ultras, 115; becomes king (1824), 124; works toward restoration in harmony with chamber and ministry, 124; exercises royal prerogative in choice of ministers, 126; forms an Ultra ministry under Polignac, 126; opposition to, 127; open conflict with the chamber, 128; determines on a *coup d'état*, 128; July revolution, 130; decides to make terms with insurgents, 130; abdicates in favour of his grandson, 132.

Charles XIV. of Sweden, made heir to throne, 554; conflict with Norway, 561.

Charles XV., King of Sweden, 561.

Charter (France), 106; Pope protests against, 690.

Chartist agitation (England), 50-54; Disraeli's sympathy with, 75.

Chosrew Pasha, Grand Vizier of Ottoman Empire, 622; attempts to regain Syria, 623, 773.

Christian VIII, King of Denmark, 567.

Christian IX., King of Denmark, 571; victory over Folkething in constitutional conflict, 576.

Christina of Spain, power of, in the government under her husband, Ferdinand VII., 296; appointed regent for her daughter Isabella, 296; gains the support of the Liberals, 297; promulgates the Statute of 1834, 297; is forced to promulgate the Constitution of 1812, 300; is deserted by the army in Espartero's revolt and flees to France, 303; is recalled by Moderates, 304; marries her favourite Muñoz, 304; remains head of the court, 304; rids herself of Narvaez and gives the ministry to her personal following, 305; revolution of 1854 obliges her to flee, 306.

Christinos (Spain), 297.

Cobbett, Radical agitation by, 27.

Coercion Act (Ireland), 71.

Commons, House of, under the new electoral system (1832), 42; principle of parliamentary supremacy set up, 42; after the reform of 1867, 68; the sovereign power, 68; "obstruction" in, 77; persistent oppo-

Commons, House of—*Continued.*

sition to Salisbury's Irish policy, 89; evolution in 19th century, 98; Commune of Paris, 188; government of, 191.

Communication, new methods of, 676.

Communists, 192, 723; alliance of, 723; manifesto of, 724; program of, 725, footnote.

Concordat of 1801 (France), 688; Concordat of 1851 (Spain), 305; Concordat of 1855 (Austria), 421, 697; abrogated, 534, 708.

Congrégation, French Catholic party, formation, 120; denounced by Montosier, 124.

Consorteria, 361; financial measures and restoration of the grist tax, 361; adjustment of relations with Pope after taking of Rome, 362; sympathy with France, 362; attitude in latent conflict between France and Prussia, 805.

Constant, Benjamin, intellectual restoration in France, 109; draws up a liberal constitution for Napoleon in Hundred Days, 113.

Constantine, Viceroy of Poland, 584; recognised by Nicholas as Tsar of Russia, 585; reappointed Viceroy, 598.

Constantinople, Conference of, 632, 633, 824.

Constituent Assembly (France), 162.

Coraï, 649.

Corn Laws (England), 21; sliding scale adopted, 31; repealed, 59.

Corporation Act, repeal of, 33.

Cortes of Portugal, powers under charter of 1826, 320.

Cortes of Spain, manifesto against them presented to Ferdinand by Serviles, 289; hall closed and records seized, 289; Cortes of 1820, 292; struggles with Ferdinand in 1803, 294; convoked in the old form in 1833 to recognise Isabella as Queen, 296; regulations of Christina's Statute of 1834, 297; subsequent agitation in political life, 298; votes the constitution of 1837, 300; legislative regulations by the Constitution of 1837, 300; position under the system of dictatorships, 304; suspended by the government, 306; convoked by Progressists to draw up a constitution, 307; the Additional Act guarantees a yearly

- Cortes of Spain—*Continued.*
 session and presentation of the budget, 307; elected by universal suffrage in 1868, 310; its composition, 310; proclaims Republic and elects a ministry, 313; convoked by Federalist ministry to make a constitution, 313; deputies driven from their hall by Gen. Pavia, 314; votes the restoration constitution (1876), 316; present conditions, 317.
- Couza, see under Alexander I. of Roumania, 643.
- Cracow Republic, 412, 776.
- Crete, insurrection of, 625, 650; second insurrection, 628; chronic agitation, 635; organic statute, 635, footnote.
- Crispi, Sicilian leader of the Republican party, aids Garibaldi, 355; prime minister of Italy, 368; second ministry, 370; his colonial policy, 399; speech at unveiling of Garibaldi monument, 370, 371.
- Crimean War, 789; restores Palmerston to power, 63; effects in Russia, 590; declaration of, 785.
- Croatia, national opposition to Austrian rule, 410; revolution of 1848, 415; Hungarian-Croatian compromise, 541; Unionist party, 543; Greater Croatia agitation, 550; Serb party of, 551.
- Culturkampf (Germany), 492, 714.
- Custoza, Sardinian army defeated by Austrian army (1848), 344, 779; (1866) 358, 802.
- Czartoriski, Prince, 597.
- Danilo, Prince of Montenegro, 663.
- Danube, declared open, 792.
- Dardanelles, opened, 620; Straits Convention, 623.
- Daru, 181; French minister of foreign affairs, 184; responsible for Franco-Prussian war, 184; on Vatican Council, 806.
- Days of June (France), 163.
- Days of March (Prussia), 442.
- Déák, Hungarian leader, reform program, 409; address party, 524; Déák party, 522.
- Decabrists, revolt of, 585, 720.
- Decazes, French prime minister, 121; policy, 121; deserted by King, 121; favours Free Masons, 719; rumours of war between France and Germany, 822.
- Defacqz, 246, 720.
- Defection, the, 125.
- Delyannis, Greek prime minister, 656.
- Denmark, gains Lauenburg, 5; formation of Scandinavian States, 554; Church, 555; composition and condition of the monarchy, 566; Schleswig-Holstein national agitation, 568; wars of the Duchies, 569; 798; Eider Danes, 569; Prussia and Austria intervene, 572; loss of the Duchies, 572; Constitution of 1866, 573; "Peasants' Friends," 573; constitutional conflict, 574; Iceland, 576; political evolution of, 843.
- Depretis, Italian prime minister, 365; makes coalition of centres against other leaders of Left, 368; Pen-tarchy to oppose, 368; list of successive ministries, 368; death, 368.
- Derby, English prime minister, leader of Protectionist party, 62; third ministry, 65; reform act of 1867, 65; retires, 69; attitude in Italian war, 794.
- Destruction, new means of, 673.
- Diebitsch, Russian general, Polish insurrection, 587; Turkish war, 761.
- Disraeli, English prime minister, 69; second ministry, 75; policy and ideals, 75; colonial policy, 75; supports Ottoman Empire in the Eastern Question, 76, 824; at Congress of Berlin, 76.
- Diet (Germany), organ of the Germanic Confederation, 376; Assembly of 1816, 377; Carlsbad Decrees, 385; publication of debates forbidden, 386; decrees of 1832, 388; liberal majority accepts work of Vorparlament, 391; restored, 398; appoints "reactionary committee," 398; repeals fundamental rights, 398; dissolved by Prussia's victory in 1866, 471.
- Doctrinal Judgment (Belgium), 231.
- Döllinger, on Infallibility, 705.
- Domela-Neiuwenhuis, Dutch socialist, 242.
- Don Carlos VI., supported by Apostolic party, 295; refuses to oppose Ferdinand, 295; left legitimate heir to throne by Ferdinand's death without male issue, 295; refuses to recognise Isabella as Queen, 296; his support, 296; the Carlist war, 300; forced to sail for England, 300; returns to Spain and sets up his court

- Don Carlos VI.—*Continued.*
 and government at Navarre, 302;
 his poor generalship, 302; his sup-
 porters divide, 302; flees to France,
 303.
- Don Carlos VII., Carlist candidate for
 "national kingship" in 1868, 311;
 second Carlist war, 314; capital at
 Estella, 315; declared legitimate
 King by the Pope, 315.
- Dresden Conference, 398, 783.
- Dualism, Austro-Hungarian, 406.
- Duchies, war of, 798. See also under
 Prussia, 466, and Denmark, 569.
- Duclerc, French prime minister, 210.
- Dufour, Swiss general, 268.
- Dulcigno, demonstration of European
 fleets before, 664.
- Dupanloup, on the Syllabus, 703,
 footnote; opposes lay schools, 708.
- Dupuy, French prime minister, 220.
- Düppel, blockade of, 572, 798.
- Dufaure, French prime minister, 205;
 second ministry defeated, 208.
- Dynamite, use of, 674.
- Eastern Question, the Allies arrayed
 against France on the, 144, 389;
 Europe hopes, by making Ottoman
 Empire a modern state, to settle,
 625; settlement of, 640; comes be-
 fore Allies, 748, 758; Congress of
 Verona, 758; intervention of Eu-
 rope, 760; Palmerston's policy, 770;
 Disraeli's policy, 76; causes rup-
 ture between France and England,
 773; Nicholas wishes to settle, 784;
 end of European concert, 785; Cri-
 mean war, 789; Congress and
 Peace of Paris, 792; reopened by
 Herzegovina revolution, 823; Rus-
 sian influence, 823; Eastern ques-
 tion divides Europe, 827; reopened
 by Roumelian revolution, 829.
- Economic Council (Prussia), 500.
- Economic Life, transformation in, 681.
- Education Act, of 1870 (England),
 71; of 1833 (France), 151; of 1850
 (France), 167; of 1842 (Belgium),
 245.
- Egyptian conflict (Mehemet Ali), 622,
 773.
- Eider Danes, 569.
- Emancipation of Serfs (Russia), 591.
- Ems Interview, 809.
- Engels, socialistic theorist, 48; agita-
 tion, 724; Manifesto of Communist
 Party, 724.
- England, settlements of 1815, 4, 6;
 condition in 1814, 10; system of
 government under George III., 10;
 unreformed electoral system, 15;
 Church, 18; social conditions, 19;
 Corn Laws, 21; reform movement,
 23; old régime, 24; Radical agita-
 tion in 1816, 26; Luddite Riots, 26;
 Spafield, 27; "Gag Laws," 29;
 partial reforms, 30; holds aloof
 from the Holy Alliance, 30; Catholic
 Emancipation, 32; electoral reform
 of 1832, 34; new conditions of politi-
 cal life, 40; Peel formulates princi-
 ple of parliamentary supremacy, 42;
 parliamentary system, 42; series of
 ministries, 43, footnote; Liberal ad-
 ministrative reforms and their re-
 sults, 43-48; industrial conditions
 and labor agitation of the trades
 unions, 48, 49; government prosec-
 utes the unions, 50; Chartist agita-
 tion, Workingmen's Parliament,
 Lovett and O'Connor, 50-54; Irish
 agitation, O'Connell and the Irish
 party, 54-57; free-trade agitation,
 Anti-Corn-Law League, Cobden,
 Bright, and Villiers, 57; repeal of
 Corn Laws, 59; industrial reforms,
 Ashley, Dennison, and Villiers, 59;
 Factory Act of 1833, Labour in
 Mines Act, Factory Act of 1844,
 Act of 1878, 60; Irish Crisis, 61;
 Maynooth Grant, 61; period of in-
 action and democratic evolution,
 62; Conservative division, Peel-
 ites and protectionists (Bentinck,
 Derby, Disraeli), 62; Ecclesiastical
 Titles bill, 62, footnote; free trade
 established, Navigation Act re-
 pealed, treaty of commerce con-
 cluded with France, 63; importance
 of foreign policy, 63; period of
 material prosperity, 63; improved
 industrial conditions, 63; federa-
 tion of trade unions, 63, 64; Adul-
 lamites, 64; electoral reform of '67,
 64; effect of the reform on political
 conditions, 68; Gladstone's re-
 forms (disestablishment of Angli-
 can Church in Ireland, Irish Land
 Act of 1870, Coercion Act, Education
 Act of 1870, abolition of army pur-
 chase, secret ballot), 69-72; trade-
 union legislation, 73; Disraeli's
 policy, foreign, colonial, and domes-
 tic, 75, 76; Irish Home Rule party
 formed, 76; "obstruction," 77;

England—*Continued.*

Irish "Land League," and the three F's, 78; Second Irish Land Act, 80; Kilmainham Treaty, 81; Invincibles assassinate secretary for Ireland, 81; use of dynamite explosions by Irish revolutionists, 81; electoral reform (1885), 82; Salisbury's first ministry, 84; "three acres and a cow," 84; Gladstone's third ministry, and the Irish question, 85; "Liberal Unionists," 85; projected system of Irish home rule, 85, 86; Ulster's petition against home rule, 86; party lines shattered at elections of 1886, 86; Salisbury's second ministry supported by the coalition, 86; Irish policy and Land Purchase Act, 88; Parliamentary opposition to Salisbury's Irish policy, 89; reform of county administration, 90; conversion of national debt, 91; naval construction, 91; break-up of Irish party, 91; formation of socialist party, 92; Gladstone's fourth ministry, 93; reform program, 94; Rosebery succeeds, 94; legislative reform of 1894 and its effects, 95; progressive inheritance tax, 95; "mend or end" the Lords, 96; Unionists again in power under Salisbury, 97; Salisbury's policy, 98; political evolution in 19th century, 98; growth of democracy, 100; English attitude in Carlist War, 302; as to Spanish marriages, 304; Portuguese affairs, 319-322; Polish insurrection, 600; Egyptian Conflict, 623, 773; influence in Ottoman Empire, 635; in Greek politics, 654; fleet sent to blockade the Piræus, 655, 761; refuses to enter Holy Alliance, 750; policy under Canning, 759; Eastern Question, 760; Anglo-Russian protocol, 760; triumph of Whigs, 762; ministers control policy, 765; Palmerston makes England rival of Russia, 765; attitude on Polish Question, 768; intervention in Spain and Portugal, 769; Quadruple Alliance, 770; rupture of alliance with France, 771; State of Good Feeling, 775; England isolated, 777; her course in Italian affairs, 777; refugees in, 781; recognition of French Empire by, 783; Nicholas tries to settle Eastern

England—*Continued.*

Question with, 784; fleet enters straits, 785; end of European Concert, 785; military impotence, 788; Crimean War, 789; Polish affairs, 797; isolation of, 822; Berlin Congress, 826; Gladstone changes Eastern policy of, 828; mutual concessions with Germany, 830; policy on Armenian massacres, 831; political evolution of, 842.

Eötvös, Hungarian nationalist, 524.

Epirus, Greek insurrection, 619, 650; second insurrection, 629; action of Congress of Berlin regarding, 634.

Erfurt Parliament, 397, 782.

Espartero, Spanish Liberal (Progressist) general, concludes peace to end Carlist war, 303; created Duke of Vittoria and becomes military dictator of Spain, 303; supports Progressist revolt against new municipal law, 303; has himself named regent and governs Spain for three years, 303; is defeated by a coalition of all parties and forced to leave Spain, 303; becomes again leader of the Progressists, and joins the revolution of 1854, 306; governs, together with O'Donnell, 306.

Espinasse, French minister of interior, 176.

Estrup, Danish prime minister, 574.

Eulenberg, Prussian minister-president, 509.

European Balance of Power, doctrine of, 766.

European Concert, doctrine of, 766.

Factory Acts (England), Act of 1833, 60; Act of 1844, 60.

Falk, German minister, 493; "Falk Laws," 493; resigns, 499.

Favre, Jules, interview with Bismarck at Ferrières, 188; on Franco-Prussian War, 816.

Fédérés, 192.

Fenian Agitation, 70.

Ferdinand, Emperor of Austria, accession and character, 411; flight from Vienna, 413; abdicates, 419.

Ferdinand, prince of Bulgaria, 669.

Ferdinand VII., King of Spain, restored in 1814 by the English army, 289; his government and unsuccessful enterprises, 290; his dislike of the army, 291; revolution

Ferdinand VII.—*Continued.*

of 1820 intimidates him, 291; his struggles with his Liberal ministries, 293; France restores the absolute government, 293; Ferdinand annuls by manifesto all acts of the "constitutional government," 294; restores the old régime as far as possible, 294; troubles in his government, 295; War of the Succession, 295; promulgates decree restoring female succession, 296.

Ferrières, interview between Bismarck and Favre, 189, 816.

Ferry, French prime minister, 208; second ministry, 210; opposes Radicals, 211; defeated by Radicals, 212; candidate for presidency, 214.

Feudal Party (Prussia), 445.

Finland, 582; system for Russification, 612.

Flanders, Liberals in (*Beggars*), 250; school law, 252.

Floquet, French prime minister, 214.

Fouché, French minister, retains office under Restoration, 111; arranges secretly for Napoleon's return, 113; dismissed by Louis XVIII., 117.

France, invaded by armies of Allies, 2; Bourbon restoration, 103; Charter, 106; conditions of political life in 1814, 108; Hundred Days and Second Restoration, 111; results of Hundred Days, 113, 222; new division of parties, 114; *Ultras*, 115; counter-revolutionary crisis brought on by Royalists, Provost Courts, White Terror, 115; *Chambre Introuvable*, 116; conflict between King and Chamber, 116; constitutional monarchy and parliamentary government, 117; beginning of a regular political life, 119; policy of Louis XVIII. and his ministry, 119; electoral and press laws, 120; reorganization period, 120; formation of a Catholic party, the Congregation, 120; Liberals gain strength, 121; Duke de Berry assassinated, 121; government of the Right under Richelieu and Villèle, 121; revolutionary agitations, Charbonniers and Free Masons, 122; press law of 1822, 123; seven-year period for chamber, 123; *Chambre Retrouvée*, 123; work of restoration under Charles X., 124; the "Defection,"

France—*Continued.*

125; unauthorized orders, 126; opposition to King, 127; origin of Orleanist party, 127; open conflict between Chamber and King, 128; Charles determines on a *coup d'état*, 129; the four ordinances of July 26, 129; conditions favouring outbreaks, 128; July revolution, 130; executive committee organized, 130; Louis Philippe named Lieutenant-General of kingdom, 131; enthusiasm over revolution and tricolour flag, 132; sovereignty of the people, 132; "July Monarchy," 133; political power centres in the Chamber, 133; political character of the national guard, 133; democratic manifestations, 134; party struggle in the government, 134; party of action, party of resistance, 134; irreligious character of the July Monarchy, 135; policy of Laffitte's ministry, 135; commercial crisis, 135; National Association, 136; the Carlists and the Duchess of Berry's insurrection, 136; Republican agitation, 136; "Rights of Man" society, 137; revolt of the Lyons weavers, 137; "Mutualists," 138; Republican insurrections in Paris and Lyons, 138; Laws of September, 139; Republican party suppressed, 139; Communist-Socialist party, formation and aims, 141; long "resistance" ministry, 142; three days' ministry, 142; break between Guizot and Thiers, 142; general union against the king and the court ministry, 143; Allies arrayed against France on the Eastern Question, 145; Molé, Soult, and Thiers, 143, 145; reappearance of Bonapartist party, 145; Guizot's ministry, 146; Pritchard indemnity, 147; foreign and domestic policy, 146, 147; agitation for electoral reform, 147; Catholic and democratic opposition parties, 148; attack on Jesuits, 149; Seasons, Communists, Icarians, remnants of Republican party, 150, 155; Democratic party and its program, 150; continued agitation for social reform, 150; work of monarchy of property classes, 150; municipal councils, penal code, educational reforms, increased deficit, 151; political conditions in 1848, 155;

France—Continued.

reform agitation by banquets, 155; revolution of 1848, 156; provisional government, 158, 159; Republic declared, 159; socialist agitation, 159; national workshops established, 160; industrial reforms decreed, 160; business crisis, 162; financial measures adopted by provisional government, 162; Constituent Assembly elected by universal suffrage, 162; its reactionary policy, 162; dictatorship of Cavaignac, 163; Constitution of, 1848, 164; election of Louis Napoleon as president, 165; his discord with the Chamber, 165; the Mountain, 166; Republican party crushed, 166; Roman Expedition, 166; electoral law of 1850, 167; education bill of 1850, 167; questions which occupied the year 1851, 168; the *coup d'état*, 170; organization of the government, 171; Empire restored, 172; suspension of political life, 173; autocratic régime, 173; "the Five," 176; events of the period, 176; Orsini Conspiracy, 176; Napoleon's foreign policy, 176; Italian war, 177, 793; revival of political life, 177; "third party," 178; Catholic party opposes the government, 178; Mexican campaign, 177, 179; failure of Napoleon's foreign policy, 179; liberal concessions, 179; Arcadiens, 180; senatorial decree of Sept., 1869, 181; *Irredentists* (Radicals, Socialists, Mutualists, and Blanquists), 182; Belleville program, 182, 183; Republican agitation, 183; constitution modified by plebiscite, 184; Prussian war, 184; fall of the Empire, 187; Government of National Defence, 187, 816; Commune of Paris, 188; election of National Assembly, 189; election of Thiers, 190; Compact of Bordeaux, 190; government of the Commune, 191; *Fédérés* and *Communards*, 192; decentralization, departmental committee, 195; national guard abolished, 195; new taxes, 195; rupture in the government, 197; Thiers resigns, 197; MacMahon elected, 190; "Moral Order" government, 190; program of Right, 199; Law of Septennate, 200; *Lois Constitutionnelles*, 201; recognition of Re-

France—Continued.

public, 201; provision for Senate, 201; Constitution of 1875, 202; struggle between MacMahon and Chamber, 205; resignation of MacMahon and election of Grévy, 207; supremacy and changes of Republican party, 207; ministries, 208-210; breach with Catholic clergy, 209; Republicans divide into Opportunists and Radicals, 211; Tonquin, 211; reconstitution of Conservatives, 212; "policy of Republican concentration," "policy of conciliation," 213; Boulanger crisis, 213; Wilson scandal, 214; resignation of Grévy and election of Carnot, 214; policy of Boulangists (Revisionist or National party), 214; transformation of extreme parties: Moderates, Marxists, and Possibilists, 216; "Rallied," 218; conciliatory policy advised by the Pope, 218; Conservatives split up, 217; Paris Labour Exchange closed, 218; Panama scandal, 218; new division of parties, 218; assassination of Carnot, 219; election of Faure, 220; political evolution in nineteenth century, 221; use of Interpellation, 226, 227, and footnote; French army sent to aid Belgium, 238; France restores absolutism in Spain, 293; sides with Christina against Don Carlos, 297; refuses to aid against Carlists, 299; share in Carlist war, 302; in Bismarck's diplomacy, 467; in Polish insurrection, 600; protector of Catholics in Ottoman Empire, 630; influence in Greek politics, 654; troops sent to blockade the Piræus, 655, 761; evolution of National Church, 691; Gallican party, 691; policy of Allies toward, 752; admitted to Holy Alliance, 754; intervention in Italy, 768; intervention in Spain and Portugal, 769; Quadruple Alliance, 770; rupture of alliance with England, 771; in Egyptian conflict, 773; "State of Good Feeling," 775; Swiss affair, 777; recognition of Empire, 783; fleet enters Straits, 785; end of European concert, 785; preponderance of, 787; leads European policy, 789; Crimean War, 789; alliance with Sardinia, 793; Zurich treaty, 796; annexes Savoy and Nice, 796; com-

France—*Continued.*

mercial treaty of 1860, 796; Polish policy, 797; latent conflict with Prussia, 804; Napoleon proposes triple alliance, 805; plan of campaign, 806; Prussian war declared, 807; London and Frankfort treaties, 817; armed camps, 819; effect of war in, 820; isolated, 822; rumours of war with Germany, 822; Berlin Congress, 826; understanding with Russia, 828; League of Patriots, 829; armed peace, 831; political evolution of, 840; Church, liberty of creed granted by the Charter, 106; condition in 1814, 110; revised Charter establishes religious equality, 133; irreligious character of the July Monarchy, 135; Catholic opposition party, 148; Paray-le-Monial, 198; policy of Catholic party under Republic, 198; breach between Catholic clergy and Republic, 209.

Francis II., Emperor of Austria, character and policy, 403.

Francis Joseph, Emperor of Austria, 419; recognises "hereditary abuses," 518; grants constitution of October, 1860, 420; deserts constitutional party, 544. [See under Austria and Germany for events of his reign.]

Franco-Prussian War, declaration of, 807; conduct of, 813; effect in Europe, 818; effect in France, 820; in political evolution of Europe, 845. [See also under France, 184, 187; under Germany, 482.]

Frankfort, Conference, 397; Parliament, 391, 696; Treaty of, 818.

Frederick III., Emperor of Germany, 502; beginning of movement against Bismarck, 503; diary, 503; death, 503.

Frederick VI., King of Denmark, 566; agitation in Schleswig - Holstein against, 567.

Frederick VII., King of Denmark, 567; course in question of duchies, 569; death, 571.

Frederick William III., King of Prussia, accepts principle of representation, 434; leaves constitutional party, 435; end of reign, 436; master of European diplomacy, 764.

Frederick William IV., King of Prussia, opposes idea of constitu-

Frederick William IV.—*Continued.*

tion, 434; beginning of reign, 438; reforms, 438; ideals, 438; caricatures of, 439; popular opposition to, 440; refuses constitution, 441; conflict with Landtag, 441; joins revolution of '48 and grants constitution, 443; end of reign, 450; position in European policy, 764.

Free Masons; struggle with Holy See, 692, 714; *Humanum Genus* Encyclical, 714; origin and evolution of, 718; aims and organization of, 718; favoured in France, 719; forbidden in Russia and Austria, 719; action in Europe, 719; in France, 122; in Belgium, 246; in Spain: connection with revolution of 1820, 291; the Blacks, 293; seven Masons executed for holding a meeting, 295; in Italy, 329; in Germany, 384; in Russia, 582.

Freyinet, French prime minister, 208; second ministry, 210; third ministry, 213.

Fuad, Ottoman reformer, 628; death, 630.

Fundamental Law (Netherlands), 230.

"Gag Laws" (England), 29.

Gagern (Hesse), 389.

Galicia (Austrian), revolution of 1848, 414; centre of Polish national movement, 532.

Gambetta, speech at trial of Baudin subscribers, 180; Belleville program, 182; escapes from Paris in a balloon, 187; minister of interior and war in 1870, 188; influence, 188, 189; election of 1871, 189; leader of Extreme Left, 199; two famous phrases, 207; upbraided for opportunism, 208, 210; forms "the great ministry," 210; resigns, 210; death, 210.

Garay, Spanish Minister; attempts financial reform, 290, 751.

Garibaldi, general under Roman Republic, 345; expedition to Sicily, 354; attacks States of the Church, 354; "dictator of the two Sicilies," 355; Aspromonte, 357; Mentana, 358; unveiling of monument to, 370-71.

Gastein Convention, 469, 799.

George I., King of Greece, 655.

George IV., becomes King of England, 30; character and influence,

George IV.—*Continued.*

30; opposes Catholic Emancipation, 32, 33; death, 34.

Germanist Congress, 390.

Germany, condition in 1814, 374; formation of Germanic Confederation, 375; Federal Act, 376; Diet, 376; individual governments, 377; constitutionalists and absolutists, 380; university persecution, 382; Wartburg festival, 384; Carlsbad Decrees, 385; constitutional opposition, Manuscript of Southern Germany, 386; revolutionary movements of 1830, 387; Press Union, 387; Hambach Festival, 387; Radicals, 388; affair of the seven professors, 389; national movement since 1840, 389; patriotic manifestation of 1840, 389; Germanist Congress, *Deutsche Zeitung*, United Landtag, Offenburg Assembly, Heppenheim meeting, 390; revolution of 1848, 390; *Vorparlament*, 391; Frankfort Parliament, 391; election of Archduke John as Imperial Administrator, 392; parties, 392; Grossdeutsche and Kleindeutsche parties, 394; Empire declared and King of Prussia chosen Emperor, 395; trouble over the election, 395; Republicans defend Constitution, 395; Republican outbreaks and extermination of party, 396; Conference of Berlin, 396, 397; Erfurt Parliament, 397; Prussian Union, 397; Dresden Conference, 398; old Confederation re-established, 398; reactionary committee, 398; work of restoration, 398; Diet directed by Austria, 398; national and liberal awakening, 464; agitation for union, 464; political clubs, 465; Wurzburg Conference, 465; Congress of Princes, 465; reform plan adopted, 465; Prussia refuses, 465; Bismarck's plan for union, 466; duchies' crisis, 466; Austro-Prussian War, 470; Confederation of 1815 dissolved, 470; new union headed by Prussia, 471; treaty of Prague, 472; Prussia's annexations, 472; formation of North German Confederation, 473; organization and government, 474; transformation of parties, 476; National Liberals, 477; the socialists, 479; Bismarck's modified policy and economic reforms, 480; Guelph Fund, 481; isolation of

Germany—*Continued.*

South Germany, 481; Customs Parliament, 481; Franco-Prussian War, 482; foundation of Empire, 482; Constitution of the Empire, 483; parties, 485; conditions of political life, 488; approximate strength of parties, 490; importance of local legislation, 490; growth of National Liberal party, 490; Culturkampf, 492; "Pulpit Paragraph," 493; diplomatic relations with Pope broken off, 493; May or Falk Laws, 493; Count von Arnim agitation, 496; Bleichroeder Era, 496; struggle against socialists, 496; Bismarck's social and economic policy, 498; "socialists of the chair," 498; new tariff law, 499; end of Culturkampf, 500; National Liberals divide, 500; Army Law, 502; Cartel, 502; Frederick III. and beginning of movement against Bismarck, 503; William II. and Christian Socialism, 503; rupture between Emperor and Bismarck, 505; Bismarck resigns, 505; New Course, 506; change in commercial and foreign policy, 506; Bismarck's opposition to Caprivi, 508; Farmers' League, 508; elections of 1893, 509; Hohenlohe succeeds Caprivi, 509; Anti-Semites, 510; Alsace-Lorraine, 510; political development in 19th century, 514; influence in Ottoman Empire, 635; evolution of national church, 692; formation of socialist program, 731; restoration after revolution of '48, 781; predominance and peaceful policy, 820; alliance of three Emperors, 821; rumours of war with France, 822; Berlin Congress, 826; formation of Triple Alliance, 827; Skiernevice interview, 828; attitude toward Bulgaria, 829; mutual concessions with England, 830; armed peace, 831; political evolution, 842.

Gioberti, Italian theologian, 336, 694. Gladstone, English prime minister.

Peelite, joins Liberals, 62; with Russell tries to lower franchise, 64; conversion to Radicalism, 69; first ministry, 70; his reforms: disestablishment of Anglican Church in Ireland, Irish Land Act of 1870, Coercion Act, Education Act of 1870, abolition of army purchase, secret ballot, 69-72; trade-union legislation, 73;

Gladstone—*Continued.*

- second ministry, opposition to Irish party, electoral reform, 79; foreign policy, 79; second Irish Land Act, 80; Kilmainham Treaty, 81; electoral reform, 1885, 82; becomes unpopular on foreign policy and retires, 84; program at elections of 1885, 84; accepts home-rule policy, 85; third ministry, 85; division of his party, 85; fourth ministry and program, 93, 94; new home-rule bill, 94; retires in favour of Lord Rosebery, 94; attitude in Turkish affairs, 632, 828.
- Goblet, French prime minister, 213.
- Gortschakoff, Russian minister, governor of Poland, 597; poses as peace-maker between France and Germany, 823; formation of Triple Alliance, 827.
- Gramont, Duke of, French minister, 184, 807; brings on war with Prussia, 809.
- Greece, insurrection, 620; independence recognised, 620; at Congress of Berlin, 634; conditions before 1820, 648; commercial prosperity, 648; national renaissance, 649; beginning of independence, 649; Palli-carès and Armatoles, 650; insurrection, 650; Mussulman invasion, 651; constitution of Troezen, 652; European fleets arrive, 652; London Conference, 652; absolutist system in, 652; Otto of Bavaria chosen king, 652; conditions after independence, 653; politics, 654; military revolt, 654; constitution of 1844, 654; political conditions under constitutional system, 654; Don Pacifico, 655; English fleet and French troops sent to blockade the Piræus, 655; effect of Crimean War on Greek politics, 655; division of parties, 655; Ionian Isles annexed, 655; George I. becomes king, 655; constitution of 1860, 655; political parties and their leaders, 656; Tricoupis and Del-yannis ministries, 656; financial disorder, 656; general prosperity, 656.
- Gregory XVI., Pope of Rome, condemns Belgian constitution, 248; revolution of 1831, 333; reform projects, 334; his government, 335; encourages movement for national unity, 337.
- Grey, English prime minister, favours the electoral reform, 34; his ministry, 34, 35; ministry divides and is reconstructed under Melbourne, 42; reforms poor-laws, 44.
- Grévy, president of French Republic, loses presidency of National Assembly, 197; elected president of Republic, 207; resigns by reason of Wilson scandal, 214.
- Grütli Union, 283.
- Guelph Fund, 481.
- Guizot, French prime minister, press law of 1819, 120; unites with Republicans against Charles' government, 127; proclaims sovereignty of the people, 132; party of resistance, 134; breaks with Thiers, 142; his theory, 142; his ministry, 145; "Satisfait," 147; Pritchard indemnity, 147; agitation for electoral reform, 147; political conditions in 1848, 155; denounced by national guard, 156; dismissed from office, 157; "State of Good Feeling," 775; Swiss affair, 777.
- Haller, L. von, 380, 434; "union of throne and altar," 689.
- Hambach Festival, 387.
- Hanover, government under Germanic Confederation, 378; constitution granted, 387; affair of the seven professors, 389; King rejects election of Prussian King as Emperor, 395; Prussian alliance, 396; Zollverein, 454; joins Austria against Prussia, 471; annexed to Prussia, 472; opposition, 480; Guelph Fund, 481.
- Hardenberg, Prussian prime minister, 425.
- Heine, 382, 387; opposes Frederick William IV., 440.
- Heligoland, ceded to Germany by England, 830.
- Heppenheim Meeting, 390.
- Herzegovina, revolt of Christians in, 628; revolt against *corvée*, 630; war, 631; Europe demands reforms in, 631; action by Congress of Berlin, 634.
- Herzen, repression of Polish national movement, 600.
- Hess, German Socialist, 724.
- Hesse-Cassel, constitution of 1831, 387; Zollverein, 454; conflict over constitution of 1831, 464; joins

Hesse-Cassel—*Continued.*

Austria against Prussia, 471; annexed to Prussia, 472.

Hesse-Darmstadt, constitution under Germanic Confederation, 379; secret society in Giessen formulates a constitution, 384; Zollverein, 453; joins Austria against Prussia, 471.

Hidalgo, 313.

Hogendorp, 230.

Hohenlohe, Prussian prime minister, 459; Chancellor of Empire, 509; rumours of war between France and Germany, 822.

Hohenwart, Austrian prime minister, 537.

Holy Alliance, 748.

Home Rule (Ireland): formation of Home Rule party, 76-78; party principles, 77; uses "obstruction," 77; demands radical reform, 79; "boycott," 79; Kilmainham Treaty, 81; Gladstone converted to, 85; the projected system of, 85, 86; support of the party, 87; extension of the doctrine, 87; Justin McCarthy succeeds Parnell as Irish leader, 91; Irish party breaks up, 91.

Humanum Genus (Encyclical), 714.

Hundred Days, 111; results of, 113.

Hungarian Compromise, 526.

Hungarian War, 419.

Hungary, liberal and nationalist opposition to Austria, 406; *dualism*, 406; constitution, 406; organization of society, 407; government, 408; Reform Diet, 408; political awakening, 409; Magyar the official language, 409; liberal reform program, 409; revolution of 1848, 414; demands for liberal reforms conceded by Austria, 414; independent government, 414; Austria breaks with Hungarian revolutionists, 417; Palatine resigns, 417; Kossuth at head of, 417; Viennese troops march on, 417; Hungarian War, 419; Republic declared, 419; absolutist restoration, 420; aristocratic system destroyed, 421; reinforced Council, 519; rejects constitution, 521; not included in constitution of '61, 522; national resistance, 523; address and decision parties, 523; demands, 524; dualism restored, 525; negotiations, 525; Hungarian Compromise, 526; *Transleithania*, 526; government under the Union, 527;

Hungary—*Continued.*

receives Constitution of 1848 again, 528; parties and politics, 540; Hungarian-Croatian compromise, 541; Bosnia Crisis, 544; political struggles since 1878, 549; nationalist agitations, 550; *Omladina*, 551; Roumans, Slovacs, and Serbs form alliance for local autonomy, 552; political evolution in 19th century, 552; restoration after revolution of '48, 781; attitude in Franco-Prussian War, 813.

Huskisson, Chancellor of the Exchequer, 30; modifies economic system, 31.

Hydra, 650.

Ibrahim, leads Egyptian army to aid Sultan, 620, 641, 760.

Icarians, 150.

Iceland, 576.

Ignatieff, Russian general, councillor under Alexander III., 608.

Industrial Legislation, in England: agitation for improved conditions of labour, Kingsley, Dennison, Ashley, 59; Factory Act of 1833, 60; minor reforms, 60; Labour in Mines Act, 60; Factory Act of 1844, 60; industrial code consolidated in the Act of 1878, 60; trade-union legislation, 73; act of 1875 on strikes, 76; compensation for accident, 98. In France: reforms granted by the provisional government of 1848, 160.

Inkermann, battle of, 791.

Initiative and Referendum (Switzerland), 271-277.

International Society, 479, 727.

International Peace League, 832.

Interpellation, 226, 227, and footnote.

Intervention, principle officially recognised, 756; signification in European policy, 765; absolutist alliance to maintain doctrine of, 771.

Ionian Isles, ceded to England, 6; creation of Hellenic centre in, 649; Republic of the Seven Isles, 649; ceded to Greece, 655.

Ireland, condition in 1814, 22; Catholic Emancipation, 32; Catholic Association, 32; repeal agitation, 54; O'Connell and the Irish party, 54; Irish agitation, 54-57; church revenues, 55; Irish demands, 56, 57; the year 1843, Tara and Clontarf,

Ireland—*Continued.*

57; famine of '45, 59; Irish crisis, 61, 62; Ireland, 61; Maynooth, 61; famine of '46, 61; end of political agitation, 62; *Fenians* revive political activity, 70; disestablishment of Anglican Church, 71; Irish Land Act of 1870, 71; Coercion Act, 71; formation and aim of Irish Home Rule party, 76-78; "obstruction," 77; "Land League" and the three F's, 78; Gladstone's treatment of, 79; Second Irish Land Act, Land Court, 80; Kilmainham Treaty, 81; the *Invincibles*, 81; assassination of secretaries, 81; use of dynamite by Irish revolutionists, 81; O'Donovan Rossa, 82; policy of Gladstone's third ministry, 85; *Orangemen*, 86; Ulster's petition against home rule, 86; work accomplished by Land Court, 87; the "Plan of Campaign," 87; Salisbury's policy, 88; Land Purchase Act, 88; division in Nationalist party, 91; elective county councils granted by Salisbury, 98; Liberal Catholic party, 693.

Irish Church, political position in 1814, 22; Catholic Emancipation, 32; Grey ministry divides on question of revenues, 42; O'Connell demands liberty and equality with other churches, 54; revenue question, 55; Anglican Church disestablished in Ireland, 71; Irish Church Surplus, 71, footnote.

Irish Land Acts (1870), 71; (1881), 80; Purchase Act, 88.

Irish Party, 54.

Irredentists, in Italy, 367; agitation placed in hands of police, 368; in Roumania, 551; in France, 182.

Isabella of Spain, succeeds her father, Ferdinand VII., 296; her mother appointed regent, 296; declared of age in 1843, 303; marries Francis, Duke of Cadiz, 304; breaks with Progressists over Church property and threatens to abdicate, 307; asks O'Donnell to form a ministry, 307; dismisses O'Donnell and forms the Narvaez ministry of Moderates, 307; recalls O'Donnell, 308; restores Moderates and Narvaez, 308; gains support of absolutists, 308; revives Catholic abso-

Isabella of Spain—*Continued.*

lutism and government by the *camarilla*, 308; her favourites, 308; receives the golden rose from the Pope, 309; deserted in revolution of 1868 and flees to France, 310; abdicates in favour of her son, Alphonso, 312.

Italian Church, regulations after restoration, 327; Siccardi laws, 348; the Roman Question, 356; entanglement of Church affairs after formation of kingdom of Italy, 360; Church property in Rome secularized, 362; Crispi's penal code, 368.

Italian War, 793. See also under France, 177, and under Italy, 351.

Italy, parcelled out in 1815, 8; political condition in 1815, and the restoration, 326; political condition after 1815, 329; the secret societies, *Carbonari*, Free Masons, *Calderari*, *Sanfedists*, 329; the Naples rebellion, 330; the Sardinian rebellion, 331; Victor Emmanuel abdicates in favour of Charles Felix, 332; succession of Carignano as Charles Albert, 332; revolution of 1831, 333; Mazzini and the Republican party, 335; Young Italy, 335, 720; the *Risorgimento*, 336, 694; revolutions of 1848, 339; internal discords, 341; reaction, 344; French expedition against Roman Republic, 345; Sardinia after the revolution, 347; Victor Emmanuel and the Constitutional Statute, 347; Siccardi laws, 348; final division of parties, 348; Cavour's policy, 349; the *National Union*, 350; agreement of Plombières, 351; formation of the kingdom of Italy, war against Austria, 351; Garibaldi's expedition into Sicily, and the States of the Church, 354; the Roman Question, 355, 796; Garibaldi defeated at Aspromonte, 357; September Convention, 357; formation of parties and internal difficulties, 359; organization of the administration, 359; financial measures, 360; *Consorteria*, 361; Sella's financial reforms, grist tax re-established, 361; Rome made capital of the kingdom, 362; strained relations with France, 362; appointment of bishops, 363; universal military

Italy—*Continued.*

service adopted, 363; Left in power, 363; qualifications for voting, 364; Depretis ministry, 365; electoral law of '82, 365; joins the Triple Alliance, 366, 367; later parties, 366; *Irredentists*, 367; Barsanti clubs, 367; Oberdank, 367; effect of French seizure of Tunis, 367; Crispi's government, 368; new penal code, 368; financial crisis, 369; colonial ambitions and policy, 369; government of the Right, 370; restoration of the Left and Roman bank scandal, 370; Crispi's second ministry, 370; present political conditions, 371, 372; Sicilian bread riots, and the Socialists, 371; Republican party, 371; Crispi retires, 372; Rudini ministry, 372; Bismarck's diplomacy, 467; separation of Church and State, 707; Austrian and French intervention, 769; Italian affair, 777; restoration after revolution of '48, 780; leads European policy, 789; alliance with Prussia, 800; Napoleon proposes triple alliance, 805; in Franco-Prussian War, 813; takes Rome, 815; makes overtures to Germany, 822; at Berlin Congress, 826; formation of Triple Alliance, 827; policy since 1870, 828; political evolution, 843.

Jahn, 383; arrested, 435; pardoned, 438. Janissaries, 616, mutiny of, 621.

Jellachich, appointed Ban of Croatia, 415; manifesto of Innsbruck, 415; civil war in Hungary, 417; appointed king's lieutenant in Hungary, 417.

Jesuits, restored by Papal Bull in 1814, 689. In France: condemned by Montlosier, 149; attacked by Liberals, 149; expelled, 691. In Switzerland: lead Democratic Catholic movement, 266, 695; expelled, 268. In Germany: expelled, 493.

John, Archduke, Austrian prime minister, 414; elected Imperial Administrator, 392.

Jordan (Hesse), 388.

Josephism, 406; fall of, 422. See also under Church and Catholic Parties, 687, 697.

July Monarchy, 133; recognised, 766.

July Revolution (France), influence on reform in England, 34; outbreak

July Revolution—*Continued.*

of, 130; influence in Belgium, 233; influence in Switzerland, 262. Junta, institution of

Kalisch Interview, 77.

Kara-Georges, Serbian revolutionist, 657; assassinated, 658.

Karakosof, 606.

Katkoff, repression of Polish national movement, 600; leader of autocratic party, 605; heads nationalist party, 608; Councillor under Alexander III., 608.

Khereddin, Grand Vizier of Ottoman Empire, 634.

Kiel, Peace of, 554.

Kilmainham Treaty, 81.

Kosciusko, 598.

Kossuth, leader of Hungarian Opposition, 409; head of Hungarian Government, 417; President of Republic, 419; flees to Turkey, 419; agitation in honour of, 550; Napoleon communicates with, 796.

Kotzebue, assassinated, 385, 754.

Krüdener, Frau von, 748; regarded by Metternich as dangerous, 752.

Kussnach, memorial of, 263.

Labour in Mines Act (England), 60.

Lafayette, French Liberal leader, 122; makes a triumphal tour through southern France, 127; given military control of July Revolution, 130; given command of national guard, 134; party of action, 134.

Laffitte, French prime minister, organization of executive committee after July Revolution, 130; brings Louis Philippe to Paris, 131; party of action, 134; policy of his ministry, 135.

Lambruschini, Genoese absolutist, Secretary of State under Gregory XVI., 335; rejected as candidate for the Papacy, 337.

Lamego, Charter of, restored by John VI. of Portugal in 1823, 320.

Lamennais, Abbé, 236, 693.

Land League (Ireland), 78.

Land Purchase Act, 88.

Landrath (Prussia), 449.

Lassalle, German Socialist, 479, 727; part in founding Socialist party, 731.

Latour, Austrian minister of war, 418.

- Lavroff, Russian Socialist, 606.
- Lauenburg, ceded to Denmark by Prussia, annexed by Prussia, 572.
- Laybach, Congress of, 757.
- Ledru-Rollin, French Radical leader, 148, 155; in the provisional government of the Republic, 159; Socialist leader, 163; candidate for presidency, 165; flees to London, 166.
- Leo XII., Pope of Rome, his policy, 333; struggle against secret societies, 692.
- Leo XIII., Pope of Rome, negotiations with Germany, 499; election of, 710; encyclicals, 711; policy, 714; struggle against Free Masons, 714; interferes in domestic policy, 715; attempts to unite Orthodox Churches into Catholic unity, 715; encyclical for Catholic union, 716.
- Leopold of Coburg, becomes King of Belgium, 235; takes Liberal ministry, 246; European policy, 765.
- Leopold of Hohenzollern-Sigmaringen, candidate for Spanish throne, 311, 808.
- Liberal Alliance (Belgium), 246.
- Liberal Unionists (England), 85.
- Livret*, labourer's pass-book, 108.
- Lois Constitutionnelles (France), 201.
- Lombardy, restored to Austria, 4, 326; Milan conspiracy against Austria, 332; revolution of 1848, 339; Lombardo-Venetian Kingdom unites with Sardinia for independence, 344; reconquered by Austria, 344; becomes part of the kingdom of Italy, 351.
- London Conference (1831), for settlement of Belgium, 237, 767; of Greece, 652; of Schleswig-Holstein, 570; of Black Sea (1871), 817.
- London, Treaty of, 817.
- Louis XVIII., King of France, restored to throne, 105; publishes liberal Charter, 105; Hundred Days, 113; flees to Belgium, 113; restored once more, 113; conflict with the Chamber, 116; policy of his government, 119; adheres to Holy Alliance, 750; death, 124.
- Louis Philippe, Duke of Orléans, 127; brought to Paris and appointed Lieutenant-General of kingdom, 131; rides across Paris, 131; pro-
- Louis Philippe—*Continued*.
 claimed king, 132; "July Monarchy," 133; democratic manifestations, 134; attacked and ridiculed by the press, 138; attempted assassinations, Fieschi, 139; parliamentary struggles, 142; tries for personal government, 143; Molé, Soult, Thiers, 143-145; Guizot's ministry, 145; political conditions in 1848, 155; revolution of 1848, 156; recalls Thiers, 157; Republic declared, 159; his parliamentary policy, 764; his position in Europe, 766; snubbed by European courts, 772.
- Louis Napoleon. See *Napoleon III*.
- Loulé, Marquis of, Grand Seigneur of the Free Masons, leader of Portuguese *Historic Left*, 323.
- Lovett, disciple of Owen, leader of the Chartist agitation, 51.
- Lubeck, Polish prime minister, 584.
- Luddite Riots, 26.
- Luxemburg, disposal by Allies in 1814, 243; joins Belgium in revolution of 1830, 243; constitutions of '48 and '56, 244; constitution of '68 and personal union, 244; passes to Duke of Nassau, 244; settlement of relations with Belgium by London Conference, 767; sale to France prevented by Germany, 244, 803.
- Maassen, Prussian financier, 452.
- Maina, 649; revolt in, 652.
- Maintenance of Treaties, doctrine of, 765; system broken up, 789.
- Maistre, J. de, on the Holy Alliance, 749.
- Malines, Archbishop of, 232.
- Manin, Venetian Republican, appointed president of provisional government of Venetia, 340; converted to national unity, 349.
- Manteuffel, Prussian general, first Statthalter of Alsace-Lorraine, 513.
- Manuel, French Liberal leader, 122; expelled from the Chamber, 123.
- Manuscript of Southern Germany, 386.
- Machinery, influence of, 672.
- Mac-Mahon, President of French Republic, 197; "Moral Order" government and its program, 197; Law of Septennate, 200; struggle with Chamber, 205; resigns, 207; in Italian war, 795; in Franco-Prussian war, 814.

- Magenta, battle of, 795.
- Mahmoud, Sultan of Ottoman Empire, 621; reforms, 621; death, 623; Eastern Question, 773.
- Maroto, Carlist General-in-Chief, leader of the Marotists, 302; forces Don Carlos to submit to his despotic tactics, 302.
- Maria Christina, wife of Alphonso XII., becomes regent after his death, 318; her early preference for Liberals, and later dependence on Conservatives, 318.
- Maria, Queen of Portugal, her accession, 320; Miguel, her regent, declares himself king, 321; restored, with the constitution of 1826, 321.
- Maritime Law, regulation of, 792.
- Martignac, French prime minister, 125; returns to Decazes' policy of conciliation, 125.
- Marx, socialistic theorist, makes use of English industrial conditions, 48; *International*, 479; influence in Russia, 606; agitation, 723; Manifesto of Communist Party, 724; Paris manifesto, 730; contest with Bakounine, 730; Marx party, 732.
- May Laws (Germany), 493; (Austria), 540.
- Maynooth Grant, 61.
- Mazzini, Genoese Republican, 335; *Young Italy* and *Young Europe*, 335, 720; his efforts for Italian unity, 335; composition of his party, 341; head of the Roman Republic, 343; incites Orsini conspiracy, 720.
- Mecklenburg, government of, under Germanic Confederation, 378.
- Mehemet-Ali, pasha of Egypt, sends aid to Sultan, 620; claims Syria as reward, 622; Egyptian Conflict, 622, 773; loses Syria, 623; forced to accept peace, 623.
- Melbourne, English prime minister, reconstructs Grey ministry, 42; prosecution of the trade unions, 49; attitude towards first Chartist agitation, 52; treatment of Irish difficulties, 55; resigns, but is reinstated, 56; defeat, 58.
- Melikoff, Loris, 608.
- Mendizabal, Spanish Liberal (Progressist) minister under Christina, 299; suppresses religious houses, 299.
- Menschikoff, mission to Turkey, 785.
- Mentana, Garibaldi defeated by troops of France and Papal States, 358.
- Metz, blockade of, 819.
- Mexican expedition, 819.
- Metternich, Bourbon restoration in France, 103; opposes Italian unity, 328; formulates theory of intervention in countries troubled by revolution, 331; opposes Prince of Carignano, 332; leader of absolutists in Germanic Confederation, 382; fights secret societies, 384; liberal movement of 1830, 388; character, 403, 750; theory of conservatism, 403; his system, 403; weakening of his system, 411; loses popularity, 412; resigns, 413; forbids Free Masons and all other associations, 719; on Holy Alliance, 750; rivalry with Alexander I., 750; his Eastern policy abandoned, 760; his system abandoned, 762; one of the masters of European diplomacy up to 1848, 764; in Swiss affair, 777.
- Miaoulis, Greek minister, 655.
- Michael, prince of Servia, 658; driven out, 658; succeeds Milosh, 659; policy, 659; assassinated, 659.
- Midhat Pasha, Grand Vizier of Ottoman Empire, 631; crushes Bulgarian insurrection, 631; fall of, 633.
- Milan, prince of Servia, 658.
- Miguel, son of John VI. of Portugal, leader of Absolutists, 320; becomes regent for his niece Maria, 321; proclaims himself king, 321; driven from the kingdom in 1834, 321.
- Milan II., prince of Servia, 659; government, 661; secures title of *king*, 661.
- Milosh Obrenowitch, work of emancipation, 658; made hereditary prince of Servia, 658; government, 658; abdicates, 658; recalled, 659.
- Minghetti, Italian leader of Right, 359; work in organizing administration, 359; minister in the Consorteria, 360; prime minister, 361; sums up his program, 364.
- Mirari Vos* (Encyclical), 693.
- Missolonghi, siege of, 651.
- Modena, given back to Austrian rule, 326; the restoration, 327; revolution of 1831, 333; Duke allies with Austria, 339; revolution of 1848, 341; restoration, 344; becomes part of the kingdom of Italy, 351; the Italian war, 352.

- Molé, French prime minister, 143; dissolves the chamber, 144; left in minority and resigns, 144; recalled, 157.
- Moldavia, Napoleon III. secures autonomy for, 626; condition up to 1856, 640; revolution of 1848, 641; formation of state of Roumania, 642; recovers Bessarabia, 646; joins Russia in war of 1877, 642; deprived of Bessarabia, 646; Ypsilanti's revolt, 757.
- Moltke, von, organizes Ottoman army, 621; report on Wallachia, 641, footnote; Franco-Prussian war, 814; rumours of war between France and Germany, 822.
- Montlosier, Gallican writer, 124.
- Montenegro, supports Christian revolt in Herzegovina, 628; revolt against *corvée*, 630; in congress of Berlin, 634; political conditions, 663; Danilo succeeded by Nikita, 663; territorial increase, 663; demonstration of Dulcigno, 664; government, 664.
- Montalembert, leader of Catholic party (France), 166; education bill of 1850, 167, 693.
- Moravia, Czech national opposition, 410; *Pan-Slavism*, 410; revolution of 1848, 414.
- Morea, European fleets sent to, 620, 760; Hellenic national awakening, 649; government, 649; revolt, 650.
- Mountain (France), 166; growth of, 167.
- Mourad V., Sultan of Ottoman Empire, 631.
- Mouravief, 601.
- Münchengraetz Interview, 770.
- Municipal Corporations Act (England), 47.
- Muñoz, favourite of Christina of Spain, 299; marries her and is created Duke of Rianzares, 304.
- Mutualists, 138.
- Naples, kingdom of, the restoration in, 329; military revolution of 1820, 330, 755; Sicilian massacres, 336, footnote; revolution of 1848, 340, Sicilian war, 342; becomes part of the kingdom of Italy, 351; the *Camorra*, 360.
- Napoleon I., effects of his rule, 1; concordat, 688; final union of the powers against him, 1; his rejection of terms offered by the Allies, 2; Hundred Days, 111, 222; ashes brought back to France by Thiers, 145, 774, footnote.
- Napoleon III., attempts to overthrow government of Louis Philippe, Strasbourg, Boulogne, 145; elected president, 165; discord with the Chamber, 165; the "Mountain," 166; Roman expedition, 166; increases personal power, 168; questions which occupied the year 1851, 168; his *coup d'état*, 170; organization of his government, 171; Empire restored, 172; autocratic régime, 173; Orsini conspiracy, 176; his foreign policy, 176; Italian war, 177; tries to win over Liberals by reforms, 177; opposed by Catholic party, 178; Mexican disaster and failure of foreign policy, 179; his liberal concessions, 179; senatorial decree of Sept., 1869, 181; failing health, 181; slowly reorganizes his government as Liberal Empire, 181; Prussian war, 184, 187; fall of Empire, 187; deposed, 190; leagues with England and Sardinia to maintain Ottoman Empire against Russia, 626; as master of foreign policy, 787, 789; predominance of, 792; Congress of Paris changes position of, 792; alliance with Cavour, 793; communicates with Kossuth, 796; Zurich treaty, 796; annexes Savoy and Nice, 796; commercial treaty of 1860, 796; Roman Question, 796; action in Polish affairs, 797; isolated and loses predominance, 797; September Convention, 799; Biarritz interview, 799; peace of Prague, 802; secret interview with Bismarck, 803; interview with Emperor of Austria, 804.
- Narvaez, Spanish general, Liberal (Moderate), assumes control of the government, 304; dismissed by Christina, 305; heads a coalition of Progressists and Moderates against the ministry, 306; called by Isabella to form a ministry of Moderates, 307; recalled, 308; policy by which he held the ministry until his death, 309.
- Nassau, decrees of 1832, 388; joins Austria against Prussia, 470; annexed to Prussia, 472.

- National workshops (France), theory formulated by Louis Blanc, 141; established by decree of provisional government of Republic, 160.
- National Defence, government of the, 187, 816.
- Nautical Isles, 650; revolt of, 650.
- Navarino, battle of, 652, 760.
- Navarre, position in the Spanish monarchy, 300; government, 300; supports Don Carlos, 300; first Carlist army organized there by Zumalacarregrui, 301; seat of Carlist government, 302; second Carlist war, 314.
- Navigation Act repealed (England), 63.
- Netchajew, Russian Terrorist, 606, 730.
- Netherlands, formation of kingdom of the, 229; social conditions in 1814, 229; effects of French occupation, 229; neutrality, 230; Belgian opposition, 230; government under Fundamental Law, 230; Revolution of 1830, 234; Belgium becomes independent of, 234; London Conference, 237; siege of Antwerp, 238; Constitution of 1848, 238; parties since 1848, 240; school question, 241; Sumatra revolt, 242; finance, army, and suffrage questions, 242; prosperity, 243; position of Luxemburg in the kingdom, 243.
- Nice, annexed by France, 796.
- Nicholas I., Tsar of Russia, 585; puts down Polish insurrection, 587; system, 588; Crimean War, 590; death, 590; on condition of Turkey, 626; Eastern policy, 760; one of the masters of European policy, 764; influence, 764; wishes to settle Eastern Question, 784.
- Nicholas II., Tsar of Russia, 613.
- Niel, French minister of war, 180; in Italian war, 795.
- Nikolsburg, preliminary peace of, 803.
- North German Confederation, 473.
- Norway, union with Sweden, 5; formation of Scandinavian States, 554; Church, 555; Democratic party, 559; government, 560; prosperity, 561; Oscar II.'s conflicts with Storting on constitutional question, 562; national conflict, 563.
- Notis et Nobiscum* (Encyclical), 696.
- Nothomb, Belgian prime minister, 236, 245; Education Act of 1842, 245.
- Novara, Austrian army defeats Sardinian Liberals (1821), 332; Austrian army defeats Sardinian army (1849), 344.
- Novosiltzow, Imperial Commissioner of Poland, 584.
- Oberdank, 367.
- Obstruction (England), 77.
- O'Connell, director of the Catholic Association (Ireland), 32; elected to Parliament, 33; forces repeal of Catholic disabilities, 33; organizes the Irish party, 54; his purposes and policy, 54; begins to agitate for radical reform and home rule, 56; the year 1843, 57; arrested and condemned, then discharged and retires, 57.
- O'Connor, Irish orator, leader in the Workingmen's Parliament, Chartist agitation, 52.
- Odilon - Barrot, French minister, leader of Dynastic Left, 146, 148; called to ministry, 157.
- O'Donnell, Spanish Moderate general, organizes the revolution of 1854 at Madrid, 306; governs, together with Espartero, 306; the *Liberal Union*, 306; takes the ministry and restores the constitution of 1845, with the Additional Act, 307; dismissed by Isabella, 307; second ministry and policy, 308.
- Old Catholics, Church of, formed, 707.
- Oldenburg, government of, under Germanic Confederation, 378; connection with Zollverein, 454.
- Ollivier, leader of third party, rivalry with Rouher, 178; relations with Napoleon III., 181; opposition of Left, 182; declares against official candidature, 183; proposes revision of constitution, 183; ministry defeated in Prussian War, 184; foreign policy, 806; proposed disarmament, 806.
- Olmütz Interview, humiliation of Prussia, 783.
- Omladina, 551.
- Orloff, Russian ambassador, connection with rumours of war between France and Germany, 822.
- Orsini conspiracy, leads to Palmerston's fall, 63; attack on Napoleon III., 176; incited by Mazzini, 720; impression on Napoleon, 793.

Oscar I., King of Sweden, 561.

Oscar II., King of Sweden, conflict with Storching, 562.

Otto I., King of Greece, 652.

Ottoman Empire, conditions in 1814, 616; government, 616; church, 617; society, 617; allies, 619; Eastern Question, 619; agitated conditions since 1814, 619; Greek insurrection crisis, 619; European intervention, 620; Straits opened, 620; Mahmoud's reforms, 621; army reform and mutiny of janissaries, 621; intellectual conditions, 622, footnote; Egyptian conflict, 622; European intervention, 623; consolidation of, 623; Straits Convention, 623; Abdul-Medjid grants constitutional charter of 1839, 623; Reschid's reforms, 624; "Old Turks," 624; England and Russia contend for influence over, 624; struggle between Reschid and Riza, 624; reforms in army, administration, and finance, 625; Ottoman Bank, 625; period of prosperity and peace, 625; England, Sardinia, and Napoleon III., unite to maintain Empire against Nicholas, 626; monks quarrel over keys of Holy Places, 626; Crimean War, 626, 789; Congress of Paris, 626; autonomy for Moldavia and Wallachia, 626; reform edict, 626; religious liberty promised, 626; administrative and judicial reforms under Fuad and Ali, 628; revolt of Cretans and Greeks, 628; reforms prove fallacious, 629; Europe protests, 629; end of French influence, 630; destruction of European concert of protectors, 630; financial crisis, 630; rebellion against *corvée*, 630; Europe demands guarantees and control, 631; French and English consuls assassinated in Salonica, 631; "Young Turkey," 631; Midhat-Pasha, 631; Bulgarian atrocities, 632; public opinion in Europe turns against, 632; Europe determines to become guardian of, 632; Conference of Constantinople and Berlin Memorandum, 632; Constitution of 1876, 632; Islamism the state religion, 632; fall of Midhat-Pasha, 632; *Evet Effedim*, 633; Europe loses faith in promises, 633; Russian invasion, 633; dismemberment after Russo-Turkish War, 633;

Ottoman Empire—*Continued*.

Congress of Berlin, 634; personal government of Abdul-Hamid, 634; Albanian revolt, 634; Panislamism, 635; English and German influence, 635; peaceful period, 635; French and Russian influence, 636; Armenian massacre, 636; powers demand reforms and guarantees, 636; Christian nations of, in 1814, 638; peace of Adrianople, 761; refugees, 781; Nicholas wishes to settle Eastern Question, 784; Russia severs diplomatic relations with, 785; integrity of, guaranteed, 792; Peace of Paris, 792; Berlin Congress, 826.

Owen, English philanthropist, founder of associations of workmen, 48; the Great National Trades Union, 49, 50; the socialistic schools, 721.

Pact of 1815 (Switzerland), 260.

Palacky, 410; Panslavic Congress, 415.

Palikao, French prime minister, 184.

Palmerston, English prime minister, leader of Liberals, 62; retires on Napoleon's *coup d'état*, 63; restored to power by Crimean War, 63; retires on the Orsini conspiracy, 63; third ministry, 63; death, 63, 64; makes England rival of Russia, 765; Eastern Question, 770, 773; work in Italy, 777; recognises French Republic, 779; refugees, 781; end of influence, 788.

Panama Scandal, 218.

Paniza, Major, case of, 669.

Panslavic Congress, 415.

Panslavism, 410.

Papal Guarantees, law of, 708.

Paris, Conference of, 643; Congress of, 626, 791; formation of state of Roumania, 642; peace of (1856), 792; siege of, 816; treaty of (1815), 5.

Paris, Count of, successor under Compact of Bordeaux, 190, 199; expulsion of "pretenders," 213; joins in cry for Revision, 217.

Parma, revolution of 1831, 333; Duke allied with Austria, 339; abandoned by Austria, 341; restoration, 344; becomes part of the kingdom of Italy, 351; in the Italian war, 352.

Parnell, takes leadership of Home Rule party, 77; party principles,

Parnell—*Continued.*

- 77; "obstruction," 77; tours through United States, 78; denounced and arrested by Gladstone, 81; Kilmainham treaty, 81; violent agitation, 81; banquet and subscription in his honour, 82; new policy of controlling ministry, 85; rumours of agreement with Gladstone, 85; compromised by scandalous divorce trial, 91; party breaks up, 91; death, 91.
- Paskiewitch, Viceroy of Poland, 587.
- Pastor Æternus (Bull), 706, footnote.
- Pavia, Spanish general, governor of Madrid, 314.
- Peasants' Friends (Denmark), 573.
- Pedro, son of John VI. of Portugal, resigns succession in favour of his daughter Maria and promulgates the Constitutional Charter of 1826, 320; comes to Europe to make war against Miguel, 321.
- Peel, English prime minister, Home Secretary, 30; reforms penal code, 30; resigns with Wellington and is recalled, 33; leader of Conservatives, 41; on the reform of '32, 41; two unsuccessful attempts to carry on a minority ministry, 42, 56; third ministry, financial and customs reforms, 56-59; repeal of Corn Laws, 59; attempts to conciliate the Irish, 61; increases Maynooth Grant, 61.
- Pellico, Silvio, imprisoned for leadership in the Milan conspiracy, 333.
- Pereira, Portuguese minister, attempts to overcome the deficit, 323.
- Pestel, execution of, 585.
- "Peterloo," massacre, 29.
- Peter's Pence, 710.
- Pfizer (Wurtemberg), 389.
- Pi y Margall, Spanish minister under the Republic, 313; first President of the Republic, 313; leader of socialist Federalists, 317.
- Pie, Cardinal, 706.
- Piedmont, revolution of 1848, 341; attacks the Austrian government openly, 350; in the Italian war, 351; the *Nazione Armata*, 353.
- Pius IX., Pope of Rome, condemns Belgian constitution, 248; grants liberal reforms, *Consulta di Stato*, 337; grants further reforms and the Fundamental Statute, 340; Roman Republic, 343; Roman Question, 355; rejects law of guarantees, 362;

Pius IX.—*Continued.*

- struggle against adversaries, 692; election of, 694; on modern errors, 698; on loss of temporal power, 698; conflicts with lay governments, 707.
- Plevna, siege of, 825.
- Plombières, interview of, 351, 793.
- Pobiédonostsef, councillor under Alexander III., 608.
- Poland, disposal of, at Congress of Vienna, 5; Polish national opposition to Austrian rule, 410; Cracow Republic, 412; revolution of 1848, 415; demand of national autonomy, 536; government of, under Russia, 583; society, 584; prosperity, 584; unpopularity of system, 584; insurrection, 586; abandoned by Europe, 586; under military dictatorship, 587; insurrection of 1863, 597; Agromonic Society, 597; granted separate ministry, 598; national movement crushed, 600; Russification, 611; Polish Question, 768; Cracow affair, 776; revival of nationalist agitation, 797.
- Polignac, French prime minister, 126; his vision, 129.
- Pomerania, ceded to Prussia by Sweden, 5.
- Ponsonby, 773.
- Population, transformation in, 678.
- Portugal, government prior to 1814, 319; army overturns system established by the English, 319; King John VI. returns from Brazil by invitation of the army and accepts the Constitution of 1822, 320; party divisions, 320; John restores Charter of Lamego, 320; the Constitutional Charter of 1826, 320; the War of the Succession, 321; Chartists and Septembrists, 322; Additional Act of 1852, 323; the deficit, 323; present political conditions, 324; Russian influence, 750; Canning's policy in, 759; intervention in, 769; Palmerston's action in, 777; Church regulations under Constitution of 1836, 320.
- Potocki, Austrian prime minister, 537.
- Potter (Belgium), 234.
- Prague, treaty of, 472, 802.
- Press, effects of machinery on, 677. In England: begins to be a power, 25; improved conditions under reform of 1832, 34. In France: liberty

Press—Continued.

granted by Charter, 106; condition in 1814, 110; penal servitude decreed for seditious writings, 116; law of 1819, 120; law of 1822, 123; prosecutions under Charles X., 124; Vandal Bill, 125; four ordinances and protest, 129; censorship forbidden by revised charter, 133; Laws of September, 139; law of 1849, 166; under Second Empire, 174; restrictions abated, 177; law of 1868, 179. In Switzerland: *Conclusum* of 1823, 262; freedom under Constitution of 1848, 269. In Spain: strict government censorship under Constitution of 1845, 304; special system decreed, 306; aggravated further by Narvaez, 307; Moderate ministry attacks journalists and professors, 309; liberty established by revolution of 1868, 310; Castelar restores system of warnings and suspensions, 314. In Germany: Carlsbad Decrees, 385; decrees renewed, 386; Press Union, 387. In Austria: Metternich system, 405; system weakened, 411. In Prussia: lacking in 1815, 429; censorship ordered, 435; censorship relaxed by king, 439; censorship restored, 439; stifled, 450; notification system, 463. In Russia: relaxation of censorship under Alexander II., 590; liberal system, 597; return to absolutism, 603; censorship restored, 609; "knocking out the caviar," 609. In Greece: freedom established, 655.

Prim, Spanish general, with Serrano, heads the provisional government of 1868, 310; governs in the name of the Progressists until his death, 311; seeks a king for Spain, 311; is assassinated, 311.

Princes, Congress of, 465.

Pritchard Indemnity, 147.

Prонunciamento, institution of, 291.

Proudhon, 150; new socialist revolution, 163, 722; *Anarchy*, 735.

Provincial Estates (Prussia), 434.

Provost Courts (France), 115.

Prussia, compensation for loss of Poland, 5, 428; formation of Germanic Confederation, 375; system of government, 378; absolutism, 380, 382; persecution of revolutionists, 388; national manifestation, 390; United

Prussia—Continued.

Landtag, 390; Little Germany party, 395; King chosen Emperor, 395; King refuses, 395; crushes the Republican rising, 396; alliance with Saxony and Hanover, 396; plan of constitution, 397; Berlin Conference, 397; Prussian Union, 397; yields to Austria and dissolves the Union, 397; reforms, 424; social and political conditions in 1815, 429; parties and political leaders, 429; absolutist reforms, 430; government of the kingdom, 430; social conditions after 1815, 431; financial organization, 432; extension of Prussian Code, 433; compulsory primary education, 433; reorganization of army, 433; creation of Provincial Estates, 434; censorship of press, 435; procedure against "demagogues," 435; conditions up to 1848, 436; Church conflicts, 437; accession of Frederick William III., 438, his reforms, 438; his ideals, 438; censorship court established, 439; conflict between King and Landtag, 441; King concedes periodic meeting, 442; Revolution of '48, 442; Days of March, 442; Frederick William joins revolutionists and grants constitution, with universal suffrage, 443; National Assembly, 444; Feudal party, 445; constitution of December 6, 446; constitution of 1850, 477; the reaction, 448; *Landrath*, 449; creation of House of Lords, 449; name Landtag adopted, 449; press stifled, 450; court party, 450; personal government restored, 450; William I. becomes Regent, 450, policy toward leadership of Germany, 451; Zollverein, 452; reform of army, 455; William I. becomes King, 456; conflict between King and Liberals, 458; Progress party and its program, 458; Representatives oppose King's army reform, 459; conflict between King and Chamber, 461; ministerial concessions in foreign policy, 461; Bismarck's first ministry and policy, 461; "notification" system, 463; opposition to Bismarck's foreign policy, 464; refuses to accept work of Congress of Princes, 465; duchies crisis, 466, 798; Bismarck's diplomacy, 467; Gastein Convention, 469; takes

Prussia—*Continued.*

Schleswig, 469; Austro-Prussian War, 470, 801; Confederation dissolved, 471; heads new union, 471; annexes Schleswig and Holstein, 472; treaty of Prague, 472; impression produced by her policy, 473; formation of North German Confederation, 473; organization and government, 474; Franco-Prussian War, 482; Bismarck's Economic Council, 500; Bismarck resigns, 505; Caprivi resigns prime-ministership, 508; Prussia in Holy Alliance, 748; Polish question, 768; Quadruple Alliance, 769; Münchengraetz interview, 770; absolutist alliance, 771; Cracow affair, 776; Swiss affair, 777; revolution of '48 and restoration, 780; refugees, 781; Austria triumphs over, 781; King confers with Schwartzemberg at Olmütz, 783; recognition of French Empire, 783; increasing strength of, 788; leads European policy, 789; refuses to join in Crimean War, 789; refuses to join in Italian War, 794; action in Polish affairs, 797; alliance with Italy, 800; latent conflict with France, 804; Triple Alliance, 805; Franco-Prussian War declared, 807; London and Frankfurt treaties, 817; foreign policy and armed camps, 819; holds predominance, 821; political evolution of, 842.

Prussian Union, 397.

Psara, 650.

Pulpit Paragraph, 493.

Quadruple Alliance, 770.

Quanta Cura (Encyclical), 699.

Radetzky, Austrian general-in-chief, leads Austrian forces in the Italian revolution of 1848, 340; defeats rebels and sets up a military government, 344; in Civil War, 416.

Radicals, in England: agitation in 1816, 26; Spafield, 27; program, 28; "Peterloo," 29; "Gag Laws," 29; Cato Street conspiracy, 30; economic reforms instituted by Place and Hume, 31; Chartist agitation, 50; Workingmen's Parliament, O'Connor and Lovett, 52; desert the Melbourne ministry, 56; joined by federation of workingmen for extension of suffrage, 64; Disraeli's

Radicals, in England—*Continued.*

early sympathy with, 75; evolution of 19th century, 101. In France, 211; join *patriots*, 213; the Boulangier crisis, 213; first radical ministry, 220; present program, 221. In Switzerland, 262; National Verein, 264; victory over Catholics, 268; reorganize Switzerland, 268. In Spain, 312. In Germany, 388; Offenburger Assembly, 390. In Serbia, 660. In Bulgaria, 666. See also under Political Evolution of Europe, 837.

"Rallied" Catholics (France), 218.

Ratazzi, Italian minister, leader of Left Centre, 349; second Garibaldi expedition, 357; failure of his foreign policy, 359; opposition to the *Consorteria*, 361.

Reform Bills (England), act of 1832, 36; its effect on political conditions, 40, 838; act of 1867, 64; its effect on political conditions, 68; reform of 1885, 82.

Refugees, 770, 781.

Reschid Pasha, Grand Vizier of Ottoman Empire, 623; reforms, 624; struggle with Riza, 624.

Reuter, Fritz (Prussia), 388.

Revolution of 1830, in France, 130; in Belgium, 233; in Netherlands, 234; influence in Switzerland, 262; makes first break in European alliance, 761; effect in Europe, 764; political evolution of Europe, 839.

Revolution of 1848, 779; revolutionary parties during, 725; effects on political evolution of Europe, 840; influence on Chartist agitation in England, 53; influence on Young Ireland, 61; in France, 156; in Belgium, 248; in Italy, 339; in Austria, 341, 413; in Germany, 390; in Prussia, 442; in Hungary, 414; in the Church, 696.

Rhigas, Greek patriot, 649, footnote.

Ribot, French prime minister, 220.

Richelieu, Duke of, French prime minister, 117; president of French Chamber, 117; resigns, 121; prime minister, 121; supported by Russia, 751.

Rights of Man Society, 137, 723; its program, 140; social revolutionary agitation, 159.

Rileief, execution of, 585.

Risorgimento, 336, 694.

- Ristitch, president of Servian re-
gency, 660; prime minister, 661;
regent under Alexander, 662.
- Riza, Ottoman reformer, struggle
with Reschid, 624.
- Rochebouet, French prime minister,
forms a "business ministry," 207.
- Rotteck, 381; suspended, 389.
- Romale, Hellenic national awaken-
ing, 649.
- Roman Bank Scandal, 370.
- Roman Expedition, 166, 345.
- Roman Question, 355, 796.
- Roman Republic established, 343.
- Rome, annexation to the kingdom of
Italy, 351, 358; secularization of
Church property, 362; made capital
of kingdom of Italy, 362.
- Rosa, Martinez de la, Spanish Lib-
eral minister under Christina, 297;
decides to grant a new constitution,
297.
- Rosebery, Lord, succeeds Gladstone
as prime minister, 94; projected
program, 94, 97; parish councils,
95; progressive inheritance tax, 95;
fall of the ministry through Liberal
dissensions, 97.
- Rouher, French prime minister, ri-
valry with Ollivier, 178; warlike
policy, 179; dismissed by Napo-
leon, 181.
- Roumania, revolution of 1848, 416;
"Roumania Irredenta," 551, 647;
Greek insurrection, 619; at Con-
gress of Berlin, 634; formation of
State of, 642; results of union, 643;
Prince's conflicts with Assembly,
643, *coup d'état*, 643; land reform,
644; constitutional monarchy, 644;
parties, 645; joins Russia against
Ottoman Empire, 646; receives
Dobrudsha in exchange for Bessa-
rabia, 647; officially recognised as
independent kingdom, 647; work
of liberal ministries, 648; prosper-
ity, 648.
- Roumelia, Eastern organization and
government of, 667; union with
Bulgaria, 667.
- Rouvier, French prime minister, 213.
- Royal Volunteers (Spain), 294.
- Royer-Collard, French Liberal or-
ator, defines theory of royal suprem-
acy, 117; press law of 1819, 120.
- Rudini, di, Italian leader of Right,
prime minister, 370; opposition to
Crispi, 372; second ministry, 372.
- Russell, Lord John, English minis-
ter, electoral reform of '32, 34;
prime minister, continues Peel's
policy, 61; second ministry deserted
by Adullamites, 64.
- Russia, settlements of 1815, 6; aids
Austria in Hungarian war, 419;
Bismarck's diplomacy, 467; terri-
torial and social conditions in 1814,
578; government, 581; death of
Alexander I., 585; secret societies,
585; revolt of Decabrists, 585; exe-
cution of Pestel and Rileiet, 585;
third section of Chancellery, 586;
Polish insurrection, 586; under
Nicholas I., 588; literature, 588;
religious persecutions, 589; pro-
cess of Russianizing western prov-
inces, 589; Crimean war and its ef-
fects in, 590; death of Nicholas and
fall of his system, 590; liberal re-
action under Alexander II., 590;
intelliguenzia, westerners, and na-
tionalists, 590; Alexander's first re-
forms, 591; emancipation of serfs,
591; effects of the land reform, 595;
liberal reforms, 596; Polish insur-
rection of 1863, 597; Polish na-
tional movement crushed, 600;
Church troubles, 602; Concordat
abrogated, 602; radical land reform,
603; return to absolutism, 603; op-
position parties, 605; Karakosof's
attempt against the Tsar, 606; So-
cialists, 606; Terrorists, 607; Alex-
ander III.'s reign, 608; autocratic
system revived, 609; censorship
of press, 609; financial measures,
610; Russification, 611; Nicholas
II.'s financial measures, 613; coro-
nation accident, 613; autocratic
system threatened, 613; protector
of Orthodox in Ottoman Empire,
618; sends aid to Sultan, 622; Russo-
Turkish war, 633, 761; Greek polit-
ics, 654; Free Masons forbidden,
719; share in Holy Alliance, 748;
influence in Southern Germany,
Sardinia, Spain, and Portugal, 750;
change in Eastern policy, 760; An-
glo-Russian protocol, 760; peace of
Adrianople, 761; Polish Question,
768; Münchengraetz interview, 770;
absolutist alliance, 771; recogni-
tion of French Empire, 783; Nicholas
wishes to settle Eastern Question,
784; peaceful policy, 788; Polish
affairs, 797; attitude in Franco-

Russia—*Continued.*

Prussian war, 813; denounces treaty of '56, 816; public opinion hostile to Germany, 821; Alliance of three Emperors, 821; Berlin Congress, 826; understanding with France, 828; Skiernevici interview, 828; predominant in the East, 831; place in armed peace, 831; political evolution of, 843; Church, concordat abrogated and monastic bodies suppressed, 602.

Russo-Turkish War, 761. See also under Ottoman Empire, 633.

Sadowa, Prussia defeats Austria, 471, 801.

Sagasta, leader of Spanish Progressists, 312; leader of Liberals, 317; unites with Martinez Campos in the government, 318; weakens position of his ministry by economies and new taxes, 318.

Saldanha, Portuguese Chartist minister, leader of *Regeneradores*, 323; his government, 323.

Salisbury, English prime minister, 84; second ministry, 86; Irish policy, 88; Land Purchase Act, 88; county administration reform, 90; conversion of national debt, 91; naval construction, 91; third ministry, 97; foreign policy, social and industrial reforms, 98.

Salmeron, second president of Spanish Republic, 314; retires from office, 314; leader of Progressists, 318.

Salonica, French and English consuls assassinated at, 631.

San Stefano, peace of, 826.

Santa Rosa, Count of, leader of Sardinian rebellion, 331; minister of war, 332.

Saragossa, sacking of monasteries and massacre of monks by Spanish Progressists, 299.

Sardinia, gains Genoa, 326; the restoration, 327; resists Austrian influence, 328; military revolution of 1821, 331; King encourages movement for national unity, 337; revolution of 1848, 340; Constitutional Statute, 340; unites with Lombardo-Venetian kingdom, 344; army defeated by Austria, 344; effects of the revolution, 346; government of Victor Emmanuel, 347; Siccardi laws, 348; leagues with England and Na-

Sardinia—*Continued.*

poleon III. to maintain Ottoman Empire against Russia, 626; Russian influence, 750; customs union with Tuscany and Pope, 777; restoration after revolution of 1848, 780; Cavour's policy, 788; alliance with France, 793; political evolution of, 841.

Sarnerbund, 264.

Saussier, candidate for presidency of France, 214.

Savoy, offered as reward to France, 793; annexed by France, 796.

Saxe-Coburg, policy of, 765.

Saxe-Weimar, constitution under Germanic Confederation, 379; Wartburg festival, 384; press censorship established, 384.

Saxony, partition of, at Congress of Vienna, 5; government under Germanic Confederation, 378; constitution granted, 387; King rejects election of Prussian King as Emperor, 395; Republican rising, 396; Prussian alliance, 396; joins Austria against Prussia, 471.

Scharnhorst, military reform in Prussia, 427.

Schleswig-Holstein Crisis, 466, 798. See also under Denmark, 567.

School Law (Belgium), 250.

Scotland, unreformed electoral system, 17; church, 19; prosecution of workingmen's unions, 50; federation of trade unions, 64; supports Liberal party and home rule, 87; socialism, 92; Socialist Labour party, 93.

Schwartzberg, Austrian prime minister, 419; one of the masters of European policy, 764; part in restoration, 780; policy toward Prussia, 782; confers with King of Prussia at Olmütz, 783.

Schweidnitz Affair, 446.

Seasons Society, organizes insurrection, 139; aims at social reform, 141; last Republican insurrection, 144; remnant of Republican party, 150.

Sebastopol, siege of, 790.

Sedan, surrender of Napoleon III., 815.

Sepoy Rebellion, leads to suppression of India Company, 63.

September, Convention, 357, 799; Laws of, 139.

- Septennate, French law of, 200; German law of (military), 495.
- Serrano, Spanish general, with Prim heads the provisional government of 1868, 310; receives the regency from the Cortes, 311; puts down Carlist insurrection, 311; struggle with the clergy, 311; appointed president of the Republic, 314; his dictatorship unsatisfactory to both parties, 315; offers no resistance to restoration of Alphonso, 315.
- Servia, revolution of 1848, 415; *Omladina*, 551; enters Bulgarian war, 632; Congress of Berlin, 634; formation of principality, 657; work of emancipation, 657; Austrian influence, 657; revolt in, 657; Kara-Georges, 657; Milosh Obrenowitch becomes prince, 658; government, 658; constitution of 1837, 658; Michael's policy, 659; army re-organized, 659; under constitutional system, 659; constitution of 1869, 660; Liberal government, 661; war against Turkey, 661; peace of Berlin, 661; Austrian party, 661; *General Union*, 661; Radicals demand revision of constitution, 661; Radical insurrection, 662; centralized administration, 662; war against Bulgaria, 662; constitution of 1888, 662; Milan abdicates, 662; Ristitch regent under Alexander, 662; Alexander's *coups*, 662; constitution of '69 restored, 663; provisional system, 663.
- Seven Professors, affair of, 389.
- Siccardi laws, 348.
- Sicily, demands independence, 331; begins revolution of 1848, 339; war against Neapolitan rule, 342; Garibaldi's expedition, 354; Garibaldi's second expedition, 357; the *Mafia*, 360; the Socialists and the bread riots, 371.
- Siebenconcordat, 263.
- Silesia, Czech national opposition, 410; *Panslavism* in, 410; revolution of 1848, 414.
- Simon, Jules, French minister, on revolution of 1848, 159; ministry, 205; dismissed, 206; joined International, 728.
- Skiernevice, interview at, 829.
- Snell, Swiss Republican, 263.
- Socialists, schools of, 721; theories in opposition to organization of Socialists—*Continued*.
 society, 721; new policy, 722; Communist parties, 723; Alliance of Communists, 723; Fraternity, 726; International, 727; work of the annual congresses, 728; Marx's manifesto, 730; formation of platform in Germany, 731; Lassalle, 731; General Union of German Workmen, 732; Anarchists, 735; National Socialist parties, 737; policy of revolutionary parties, 739; International Socialist Congresses, 743; in political revolution of Europe, 839, 844. In England: formation of parties, 92; "League for Nationalization of the Land," "League for Restitution of the Land," "Social Democratic Federation," 92; Tom Mann and John Burns, 93; Socialist Labour Party, 93; first to sit in Parliament, 93; socialistic ideas gain ground, 961. In France: formation of Communist-Socialist party, 140; aims of the party, 141; Louis Blanc, 141; continued agitation for social reform, 150; after the Revolution of 1848, 159; Rights of Labour, 160; national workshops established, 160; "Organization of Labour," 160; government committee on labouring classes, 160; slight representation in Constituent Assembly, 162; twice attempt new revolution, 162; "Days of June," 163; party stamped out, 164; remnants gathered into Assembly of 1849, 166; mingle with Radical party, 183; revival of, 217; Marxists and Possibilists, 217; "Social Republic," 217; Socialist Congress of 1892, 217; Paris Labour Exchange closed, 218; become a purely political party, 221. In Netherlands, 242. In Belgium, 255. In Switzerland, 283; Grütli Union, 283; Wohlgenuth Case, 283. In Germany, 479; Socialist Workingman's Party, 486; repression of, 496; "Socialists of the chair," 498; "State Socialists" and "Christian Socialists," 501; revival, 506; success in elections of '93, 509; Emperor's struggle against, 509. In Austria: demonstration by, 537; crushed, 546; social democratic industrial party, 548. In Sweden, 559; in Norway, 565; in Russia,

Socialists—*Continued.*

606; in Roumania, 647; in the Church, Leo XIII. issues Encyclical *Humanum Genus* against, 715.

Solferino, battle of, 351, 795.

Sonderbund, 267, 778.

Soult, French prime minister, 144; Eastern Question, 774.

Spafield, 27.

Spain, condition in 1814, 286; restoration of 1814, absolute king brought back by English army, 289; effects of the wars, 290; revolution of 1820 by the officers of the army restores the constitution of 1812, 290; institution of *junta* and *pronunciamiento*, 291; organization of parties and Cortes of 1820, 292; financial difficulties, 292; France restores the absolutist government, 293; "Royal Volunteers," 294; permanent results of the revolution, 294; troubles in the government, 295; war of the succession, 295; Ferdinand decrees his daughter Isabella his successor, 296; her mother, Christina, takes the regency, 296; Christina gains the support of the Liberals, 297; *Carlists* and *Christinos*, 297; government attempts administrative reforms, 297; Christina promulgates the Statute of 1834, by which Spain becomes a constitutional monarchy, 297; subsequent agitation in political life, 298; Mendizabal attempts to pay off the national debt, 299; the Queen is forced by Progressists to promulgate the constitution of 1812, 300; the Constitution of 1837, 300; the Carlist war, 300; composition and tactics of the two armies, 301; peace made at Convention of Vergara, 302; military dictatorship of Espartero and of Narvaez, 303; Constitution of 1845, 304; the Spanish marriages, 304, 775; the system of dictatorship, 304; financial regulations made by the Moderates, 304; Moderates adopt an absolutist policy, 305; period of reaction throughout Europe, 305; Concordat of 1851, 305; constitutional reform projects bring about the revolution of 1854, 306; O'Donnell's *Liberal Union*, 306; government of Espartero and O'Donnell, 307; Progressist resto-

Spain—*Continued.*

ration, 307; O'Donnell restores the Constitution of 1845, with the Additional Act, 307; the Narvaez ministry restores the former system, 307; O'Donnell's second ministry and policy, 308; transformation of parties and public opinion, 308; series of insurrections and revolution of 1868, 309; Isabella flees and provisional coalition government set up at Madrid, 310; manifesto proclaims principles of the new system, 310; clergy fight against religious liberty and the revolutionary government, 311; coalition breaks up over choice of a King, 311; Amadéo, Duke of Aosta, chosen, 311; difficulties of his government, 312; Isabella abdicates in favour of her son Alphonso, who is supported by a Moderate-Unionist coalition, 312; the Radical government is opposed by clergy and army officers (see under *Hidalgo*), 313; Amadéo abdicates, 313; Cortes proclaims a Republic, 313; Republican party divides, 313; Federalist *coup d'état*, 313; *Cantonist* revolt, 313; Pi y Margall, Salmeron, Castelar, 314; army once more controls the government through Pavia's *coup d'état*, 314; Serrano appointed president, 314; second Carlist war, 314; restoration of Alphonso, 315; his ministry, 315; conciliates the Pope, 315; end of second Carlist war, 316; constitution of 1876, 316; constitutional guarantees restored, but decrees of dictatorship not abrogated, 316; the constitutional monarchy, 317; reorganization of parties, 317; death of Alphonso XII., and regency of Maria Christina, 318; universal suffrage established, 318; internal and external troubles, 318-19; present condition of Spain, 319; Russian influence in, 750; intervention in, 769; Quadruple Alliance, 770; political evolution of, 844. Church: opposed to liberal system, 292; Mendizabal suppresses religious houses, 299; religious regulations under the Constitution of 1837, 300; Concordat of 1851, 305; abolition of Church jurisdiction and sale of Church property sanctioned by Pope, 305;

Spain—*Continued.*

- religious liberty established by revolution of 1868, 310; clergy fight against religious liberty, 311; restoration ministry conciliates the Pope, 315; Church under constitution of 1876, 316.
- Spanish Liberals, 289; under Christina, 297; divisions, 298; desert Moderates, 305; present condition, 316-17.
- Spanish Marriages, 304, 775.
- Speranski, 581.
- Spezzia, 650.
- Stambouloff, Bulgarian prime minister, 668; assassinated, 669.
- Stang, Norwegian prime minister, 565.
- State of Good Feeling, 775.
- States of the Church, the restoration in, 327; revolution of 1831, 333; government, 334; annexed to the kingdom of Italy, 351; attacked by Garibaldi, 354.
- Statute of 1834 (Spain), 297.
- Steen, Norwegian prime minister, 565.
- Stein, Baron vom, Prussian minister, 375; reforms, 424.
- St. Arnaud, French minister of war, 170.
- St. Petersburg, Conference of, 760.
- St. Simon, French Socialist, 721.
- Stoecker, 501, 504.
- Stourdza, university persecution in Germany, 384; hospodar of Moldavia, 641; Roumanian prime minister, 648.
- Straits Convention, 623, 775.
- Strauss, in the Zurich affray, 266.
- Strossmayer, at Vatican Council, 704; received by Leo XIII., 715; attempt to unite orthodox churches into Catholic unity, 715.
- Surlet de Chokier, Belgian Regent, 235.
- Suter, 276.
- Sverdrup, Norwegian prime minister, 563.
- Sverdrup, John, Norwegian pastor, 564.
- Syllabus, 701; publication of, forbidden by French government, 178.
- Syria, claimed by Mehemet-Ali, 622; assigned to him, 622; restored to Sultan by Europe, 623.
- Sweden, cession of Pomerania to Prussia, and union with Norway,

Sweden—*Continued.*

- 5; formation of Scandinavian States, 554; Church, 555; transformation of constitution, 556; reforms, 556; transformation of Diet, 557; parties, 557; national movement, 566.
- Switzerland, settlements of 1815, 6; condition in 1814, 257; Act of Mediation, 258; restoration, 259; Alexander of Russia opposes restoration of old régime (Laharpe and Jomini), 259; Pact of 1815, 260; constitution of the cantons, 260; "Conclusum," 262; regeneration, 262; Radical party, 262; Snell's "Memorial of Kussnach," 263; Siebenerconcordat, 263; Sarnerbund, 264; confused political life, 264; local conflicts, 265; Church troubles, 265, 281; labour reforms, 283; Wohlgemuth Case, 283; Grütli Union, 283; political evolution of, 844; Church: trouble with Pope over Articles of Baden, 265; religious freedom under Federal Constitution of 1848, 269.
- Taaffe, Austrian prime minister, 545.
- Tak, Dutch prime minister, 243.
- Talleyrand, French envoy to Congress of Vienna, 3; his policy, 3; secures defensive alliance with Austria and England, 4; organizes demonstration in favour of Bourbons, 104; retains his office under restoration, 111; dismissed by Louis XVIII., 117; in Orleanist party, 127; share in settlement of Belgium, 767.
- Tchernagora. See under *Montenegro*.
- Teplitz Interview, 771.
- Terrorists (Russia), 607.
- Test Act, repeal of, 33, 693.
- Thessaly, revolt, 629; Congress of Berlin, 634; commercial prosperity, 648; Hellenic national awakening, 649.
- Thiers, French prime minister, a founder of the Orleanist party, 127; draws up a proclamation against Charles X., 131; brings Louis Philippe to Paris, 131; proclaims sovereignty of the people, 132; breaks with Guizot, 142; his theory, 142; compelled to resign, 143; second ministry, 144; policy, 145; resigns, 145; recalled, 157; demands the "necessary liberties," 178; action during Franco-Prussian

Thiers—*Continued.*

war, 187, 189, 816; elected head of government, 190; policy, 190; government, 194; resigns, 197; on Eastern Question, 774; action in London and Frankfort treaties, 817.

Thorbecke, Dutch minister, 239.

"Three Acres and a Cow" agitation (England), 84.

Three Emperors, Alliance of, 821.

Three F's (Irish Land), 78.

Tirard, French prime minister, 214.

Tisza, Austrian prime minister, 543.

Tolstol, Russian minister of education, 605; dismissed, 608; recalled, 609.

Tonquin agitation, 211.

Tortosa, Compact of, 311.

Trade Unions, in England; Origin, 48, 49; Chartist agitation, 50; break away from the Chartist movement, 53; build up central organization, Council of the Unions, 63, 64; policy, 64; legislation, 73; Parliamentary Committee of the, 92; change in character, 92; London dock strike, 93; Tom Mann and John Burns, 93; fund for sending members to Parliament, 96. In France: forbidden in 1815, 108; Napoleon III. permits unions, 177.

Transylvania, incorporation with Hungary, 409.

Tricoups, Greek prime minister, 656.

Triple Alliance, 827.

Tripolitza, blockade of, 650.

Trochu, military governor of Paris, 187.

Troppau, Congress of, 755.

Tugendbund, 384.

Turkey. See under *Ottoman Empire*.

Turkish War, 824.

Tuscany, given back to Austrian rule, 326; the restoration, 327; Grand Duke encourages movement for national unity, 337; Duke grants liberal reforms, 338; Duke grants a constitution, 340; revolution of 1848, 341; Republic proclaimed, 344; restoration, 345; becomes part of the kingdom of Italy, 351; customs union with Sardinia and Pope, 777.

Ultras, or Ultra-royalists (France), opposed to *Charlie*, 115; majority in Chamber of 1815, Ultra ministers, 117; conflict with Louis XVIII.,

Ultras—*Continued.*

118; gain control in 1820, 122; legislation and policy of, 123; ministry of, under Polignac, 126.

Ultramontanes, in France, 124, 149. See also under Church and Catholic Parties.

United Landtag, 390, 440.

Unkiar-Skelessi, treaty of, 622, 770.

Vatican Council, 704, 806.

Venetia, ceded to Austria by Congress of Vienna, 4; revolution of 1848, 339; Lombardo-Venetian kingdom unites with Sardinia for independence, 344; reconquered by Austria, 344; becomes part of the kingdom of Italy, 351, 357. See also under Austria, 523.

Vergara, Convention of, ends the Carlist war, 303.

Verona, Congress of, 758.

Vichnegradzky, Russian financier, 610.

Victor Emmanuel, son of Charles Albert, makes peace with Austria in 1849, 344; his liberal government, 347. See also under *Italy*.

Victoria, becomes Queen of England, 42; parliamentary character of her reign, 42; proclaimed Empress of India, 76.

Vienna, Campaign, 418; Conference of, 385; Congress of, 2; questions to be settled at, 3; France's position at, 3; territorial settlements at, 4; decisions regarding France after the Hundred Days, 5; final act of, 5; work of, 6; peace of, 799. Villafranca, interview of, 796.

Villèle, French prime minister, 121; opposition to Chamber, 125; resigns, 125.

Vorparlament, 391.

Waddington, French prime minister, 208.

Waldeck Rousseau, candidate for presidency of France, 220.

Wallachia, Napoleon III. secures autonomy for, 626; condition up to 1856, 640; revolution of 1848, 641; merged in state of Roumania, 642.

Wangenheim, 386.

Wartburg Festival, 384.

Wealth, increase of, 679.

Wekerle, Austrian prime minister, 550.

- Welcker, 381; suspended, 389.
- Wellington, Duke of, ministry, 33; carries Catholic emancipation, 33; attitude on Parliamentary reform, 34; intrusted with defence of London, 54.
- Westphalia, forms part of Prussian indemnity, 5.
- White Terror, 116.
- Wielopolski, Polish minister, 598.
- William I., King of Prussia, unpopular as absolutist leader, 442; becomes Lieutenant, later Regent, 450; becomes King, 455; army reform, 455; government of, 456; head of army, 457; wins confidence of Liberals, 458; doctrine of divine right, 458; conflict with Liberals, 458; crowned Emperor, 482; fidelity to Bismarck, 502; increases Prussia's strength, 788; declaration of war with France, 807; death, 502.
- William II., Emperor of Germany, 503; character, opinions, and policy, 503; rupture with Bismarck, 505; the "New Course," 505; struggle against socialists, 509.
- William I., King of Netherlands, 230; revolution of 1830, 234; refuses to accept settlements of London Conference and renews war, 238; abdicates, 238.
- William II., King of Netherlands, 239.
- William III., King of Netherlands, 244.
- William IV., King of England, 34; tries to take ministers of his own choosing, 42; succeeded by Victoria, 42.
- Willich, 726.
- Windischgraetz, Austrian commander during civil war, 416; in Hungarian war, 419; prime minister, 548.
- Wohlgemuth Case, 283.
- Wurtemberg, constitution under Germanic Confederation, 379; constitutional opposition in, 386; decrees of 1832, 388; national manifestation, 390; King rejects election of Prussian King as Emperor, 395; in Zollverein, 453; joins Austria against Prussia, 471, 783; supported by Russia, 751.
- Wurzburg Conference, 465, 696.
- Young Europe, 720.
- Ypsilanti, Greek insurrection, 619, 651, 757; "arch-strategist," 651.
- Zach, Austrian prime minister, 421; Concordat of 1855 and fall of Josephism, 422.
- Zollverein, 452.
- Zorilla, Ruy, leader of Spanish Radicals, 312; leader of Progressists, 318.
- Zurich, treaty of, 796; affray of, 265.
- Zumalacarregui, organizes the first Carlist army in Navarre, 301; besieges Bilbao and is killed, 302.

SEIGNOBOS'S POLITICAL HISTORY OF EUROPE

since 1814.

By CHARLES SEIGNOBOS. Translation edited by Prof. SILAS M. MACVANE, of Harvard University. xx + 881 pp. 8vo. \$3.00 net.

The author's capacity for seizing on the decisive events of recent European history, his skill in using one event to explain another, his steady interest in the welfare of the common mass of men, his thorough freedom from national or other prejudice, and above all his very suggestive generalizations on the later history of Europe, give his work instructive qualities not always found in our general histories.—*From the Editor's Preface.*

"The best history of Europe in the nineteenth century that has yet appeared."—*Prof. H. Morse Stephens of Cornell University, in Book Reviews.*

SEIGNOBOS'S HISTORY OF THE ROMAN PEOPLE

Translation edited by Dr. WM. FAIRLEY. With maps and numerous illustrations. 528 pp. 12mo. \$1.50 net.

This history has all the clearness characteristic of French historical writing, and is graphic in its presentation. Large use has been made of the legendary and anecdotal material, but the subordinate importance of this has been indicated by placing it in smaller type than the body of the text. The space thus gained has been utilized to carry on M. Seignobos's work from the time of Theodosius I. to Charlemagne. The editor has also appended to each chapter a list of sources available in English, and a very full set of Parallel Readings.

SEIGNOBOS'S FEUDAL RÉGIME

Translated by Prof. E. W. Dow, University of Michigan. 70 pp. 8vo. Paper. 50c. net.

This notable monograph, originally contributed to Lavissee and Rambaud's "Histoire Générale," has been pronounced by authorities to be perhaps the most illuminative work on its subject.

LANGLOIS & SEIGNOBOS'S STUDY OF HISTORY

An Introduction to the Study of History. By CH. V. LANGLOIS and CH. SEIGNOBOS. Translated by G. G. BERRY. With a Preface by F. YORK POWELL. 350 pp. 8vo. \$2.25 net.

"It points out how facts in the past are to be determined, and how they are to be used in writing history. It is full of interest for every student of history, and of valuable suggestions for those who write or hope to write it."—*Journal of Education* (London).

HENRY HOLT & CO.

NEW YORK
CHICAGO

viii '08

Medieval Europe

395-1270.

By CHARLES BÉMONT and G. MONOD.

Translated by MARY SLOAN, with notes and revisions by PROF.
GEORGE BURTON ADAMS, of Yale.

556 pp., 12mo, \$1.60 net.

¶ The original work has come to be well-nigh universally regarded as the best general account of the period it covers to be found in any language.

THE DIAL :

"Combines happily simplicity of statement with a greater fullness of detail. By grouping details around the most important facts in preference to a mere chronological enumeration of events, the work obtains a certain unity."

AMERICAN HISTORICAL REVIEW :

"Prepared by real scholars. Besides accuracy, [it has] a certain combination of clearness with brevity and of definiteness with generalization that is not always found in such a book. It is a pleasure to have it at last done into English, and by competent hands."

PROF. GEORGE L. BURR, of Cornell :

"The book of Bémont and Monod I have long regarded as the very best text-book known to me in its field."

PROF. DANA C. MUNRO, of the University of Wisconsin :

"I am very glad to see the translation. This is one of the best books we have ever had for Medieval history."

PROF. MERRICK WHITCOMB, of the University of Cincinnati :

"The most comprehensive and accurate presentation we have yet had of the period, and the best adapted for class purposes."

PROF. A. B. SHOW, of Leland Stanford Junior University :

"I regard the work as the very best general history of the Middle Ages now available in English."

HENRY HOLT & COMPANY,
NEW YORK. (x,'03). CHICAGO.

"A FASCINATING BOOK"

Times' Review in a notice of a column and a half.

America, Asia and the Pacific

WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO THE RUSSO-JAPANESE
WAR AND ITS RESULTS

By DR. WOLF VON SCHIERBRAND, *Author of "Germany of To-day"*

13 maps, 334 pp. \$1.50, *net.* (By mail, \$1.62.)

This book treats the present conflict and its probable results as only preliminary to larger considerations. It considers America's relations to all the countries affected by the Panama Canal, to those on both coasts of the Pacific, and to the islands, besides analyzing the strength and weakness of our rivals.

Public Opinion:—"A most interesting treatise . . . having an important bearing upon our future progress."

Review of Reviews:—"His observations on the Panama Canal and the future of the Dutch East Indies are particularly interesting and suggestive."

Outlook:—"An interesting . . . survey of a broad field. . . . The work contains a great variety of useful information concerning the many countries under review . . . especially valuable to American exporters."

Literary World (Boston):—"While the work is primarily intended to relate particularly to the present war and its outcome, it contains many facts and figures about nearly all countries in the world, which are convenient for reference, and readily may be found by consulting a very good index at the end of the volume."

Philadelphia Ledger:—"Will repay perusal by every thoughtful business man. . . . Presenting in a forceful and attractive manner the importance of the Pacific as the future field for the world's political and commercial activity."

Brooklyn Eagle:—"A forceful and animated setting forth of certain world-important conditions as they obtain to-day."

Detroit Free Press:—"Most illuminating. . . . The author is a keen student of world forces. He has the insight of the historian, the grasp of the logician, a forcible and lucid style, and writes with the sincerity of conviction."

San Francisco Chronicle:—"Possesses the great merit of directing the attention of the American people to the necessity of prompt and energetic action if they would reap the fruits of their position on the Pacific . . . the production of an eminent publicist."

Washington Star:—"His entire discussion is suggestive and stimulating. Data and reasoning worth profound consideration."

. Of interest in this connection are WALLACE'S RUSSIA, fifteenth printing. \$2.00.

—KRAUSSE'S RUSSIA IN ASIA, 1558-1899. With twelve maps. (Second printing.) \$4.00.

—THOMPSON'S RUSSIAN POLITICS, with maps. \$2.00.

Henry Holt and Company
Publishers (1904) New York

GORDY'S HISTORY OF POLITICAL PARTIES IN THE UNITED STATES

IN FOUR VOLUMES.

Vol. I, 1783-1809. *SECOND EDITION, THOROUGHLY RE-
VISED.* 598 pp. 12mo. \$1.75, *net, special.*

This volume by itself presents a well-rounded history of the Federal Period. It is intended for the thoughtful reader without much previous knowledge of the subject.

Nation (1st notice): "**May be read not only by beginners, but by almost anybody, with profit.** It is written in a clear and simple style, is entirely non-partisan, and makes the causes of the early party struggles much clearer than many a more elaborate account."

Nation (2d notice): "Four years ago we had an opportunity to pronounce a favorable judgment on it. . . . Now there is much extension in addition to a thorough revision. . . . The opening sentences (no mean criterion often) are of a nature to whet the appetite for what is to come."

Boston Herald: "Dr. Gordy writes easily and vivaciously, and makes his 'parties' as interesting as if they were persons, . . . but his best quality is his impartiality."

Chicago Evening Post: "Most interesting to the student of history. . . . The history of the Federalist party is traced up to its defeat by the Republicans in 1800, the issues then and in the contests that followed being clearly defined and fully explained."

Chicago Tribune: "The book is well worth careful study, for the author's research has been wide and deep, his judgment is good, and he is apparently free from political or sectional bias. The working out of our national destiny between the Jeffersonian party's fear of centralized government and the Hamiltonian party's fear of disorder and injustice from a government of the unthinking rabble, is well set forth in the present volume, which brings the story down to the end of Jefferson's administration."

Public Opinion: "This is the most pretentious book of the kind that has yet been attempted, and in point of detail of treatment and historical comprehensiveness it is not far from the best."

Brooklyn Daily Eagle: "Gives promise of being the most comprehensive and scholarly discussion of the kind that has yet been produced."

World's Work: "A book of first-hand research, useful for reference."

Hartford Courant: "A well-constructed work . . . of great value."

Providence Journal: "The general tone of the book is admirable. On every page careful research is shown. It is, perhaps, not too much to say that it is likely to become a standard work on this subject."

HENRY HOLT & CO. 29 West 23d Street
New York
N. Y.

KUHNS'S GERMAN AND SWISS SETTLEMENTS OF COLONIAL PENNSYLVANIA

A Study of the So-called Pennsylvania Dutch.

By OSCAR KUHN, *Member of the Pennsylvania Society of the Sons of the Revolution, of the Pennsylvania-German Society, and of the Lancaster County Historical Society.* 268 pp. 12mo. \$1.50.

"All that is best in their history is compressed into this little volume, and even their defenders will be surprised to learn how much romance there is in the story of their sufferings in the Palatinate, and how much spiritual exaltation there was back of their emigration to America. . . . The author's account of the religious faith and feeling of the German Quakers is written with great sympathy and insight, and his apology for the deep-seated conservatism of the Pennsylvania Dutch is skillfully made."—*Outlook*.

"An historical work of peculiar and capital interest. . . . A chapter in modern history, particularly in American history, which Americans in whatever part of the country cannot afford to be ignorant of. . . . The writer has managed with extraordinary skill to infuse into his narrative the constant element of personal interest, so that the whole story is **transfused with the spirit of a fascinating romance.**"—*Chicago Evening Post*.

"Ein erschöpfendes Bild jener einwanderung, dass sich durch sachliche Ruhe und Unparteilichkeit auszeichnet und einer ausführlichen Besprechung werth ist. . . . So interessant auch die Ausführungen des Verfassers über die vielen Sekten sind, die theils sich hier niederliessen, theils hier gebildet wurden, so können wir ihm darin nicht folgen."—*N. Y. Staats-Zeitung*.

"No more exhaustive account of the origin, emigration and subsequent history of the early German and Swiss settlers in Pennsylvania than this has yet been issued. . . . The appendix concerning the change in form undergone by many Pennsylvania-German family names, the bibliography, and index contribute greatly to the interest and practical importance of Mr. Kuhn's valuable monograph."—*Philadelphia Ledger*.

"It is a first-rate service to the cause of American history which Oscar Kuhn has rendered in his popular yet scholarly book. . . . An exceedingly interesting and instructive story."—*Chicago Record-Herald*.

MCCRACKAN'S RISE OF THE SWISS REPUBLIC

A History. By W. D. McCRACKAN. *Second Edition, Revised and Enlarged.* x+423 pp. 8vo. \$2.00.

"This is the most convenient and serviceable book in English on Swiss history and development, and America has much to learn from the experience of our sister republic."—*Prof. Albert B. Hart, of Harvard*.

"It seems to me that you have happily blended the picturesque treatment which some parts of Swiss history demand, with the object of bringing out the political lesson of the last thirty or fifty years. I trust your book may do much to show our people, as well as yours, how much is to be learned from a study of Swiss affairs."—*The Right Hon. James Bryce, M.P.*

"All things considered, this history seems to me to be far and away the best Swiss history ever yet published in English."—*English Historical Review*.

HENRY HOLT & CO.

29 West 23d Street
New York

W1 '08

ENGLISH ROMANTICISM

By Prof. HENRY A. BEERS of Yale

2 vols. 12mo, laid paper, gilt tops

THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY. \$2.

Contents: The Subject Defined; The Augustans; The Spenserians; The Landscape Poets; The Miltonic Group; The School of Warton; The Gothic Revival; Percy and the Ballads; Ossian; Thomas Chatterton; and The German Tributary.

"The individuality of his style, its humor, its color, its delicacy . . . will do quite as much to continue its author's reputation as his scholarship. The book is the work of a man who has studied hard, but who has also lived."—*New York Commercial Advertiser*.

"One of the most important contributions yet made to literary history by an American scholar."—*Outlook*.

"Remarkably penetrating and scholarly. It is a noteworthy book by an acknowledged authority upon a most interesting period."—*New York Times Saturday Review*.

"Always interesting. . . . On the whole, may be commended as an excellent popular treatment of the special subject of the literary revival of mediævalism in the eighteenth century in England."—*Nation*.

THE NINETEENTH CENTURY. \$1.75 net. (Postage 15c.)

Contents: Walter Scott; Coleridge, Bowles, and the Pope Controversy; Keats, Leigh Hunt, and the Dante Revival; The Romantic School in Germany; The Romantic Movement in France; Diffused Romanticism in the Literature of the Nineteenth Century; The Pre-Raphaelites; Tendencies and Results.

"Among the few really great contributions to the study of Anglo-Saxon literature yet made by American scholars. . . . Prof. Beers is a delightfully human student, a companion on the way, not a Dry-as-dust of portentous mien."—*Mail and Express*.

"Where there is need of taste in forming and realizing an impression, and play for a gift of humorous and picturesque phrase of expression. Prof. Beers is at his best. . . . Full of felicitous judgments and memorable sentences."—*Nation*.

"There is a large feeling of the onward sweep of events that is almost dramatic. . . . It is in making his readers understand the spirit of the age that Prof. Beers excels."—*Book-Buyer*.

"Full of color, change, animation, and vivacity. The general romantic 'chain' is traced with an instinct that is unerring. . . . He does not neglect to mention such newcomers as Hewlett, Yeats, and John Davidson."—*Chicago Post*.

HENRY HOLT & CO.

29 West 23d Street,
New York

TWO BOOKS BY THE LATE
FRANCIS A. WALKER

President of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology

DISCUSSIONS IN ECONOMICS AND STATISTICS

Edited by Professor DAVIS R. DEWEY.

With portrait. 454 + 481 pp. 2 vols. 8vo. \$6.00 net.
Important papers on Finance, Taxation, Money, Bimetallism, Economic Theory, Statistics, National Growth, Social Economics, etc. The author had hoped to himself bring these papers together.

The Dial: "Professor Dewey has performed a real service to the public, as well as to the memory of his late chief. . . . In the present collection the editor has not included everything General Walker ever wrote, but has aimed, so far as possible, to avoid repetitions of thought . . . there are some discussions of the national finances in the period following the Civil War, which have a timely as well as historical interest at the present time. . . . To improve the census was General Walker's work for many years, and his experience cannot fail to be of interest to the present generation. . . . Economics in the hands of this master was no dismal science, because of his broad sympathies, his healthy, conservative optimism, his belief in the efficacy of effort; and, in a more superficial sense, because of his saving sense of humor and his happy way of putting things . . . he was the fortunate possessor of a very pleasing literary style . . . clear and interesting to the general reader, as well as instructive to the careful student. There could have been no more fitting monument to his memory than these two volumes, together with the other volume of 'Discussions in Education.'"

New York Commercial Advertiser: "Clear, direct and forceful, full of familiar illustration and appeal to fact, and always interesting. Certainly no other man has had such a wide influence on the economic thought of America, or has done so much to elevate it. . . . This statement, however, can give no adequate notion of the wealth of material or wide scope of subjects covered by these shorter articles . . . one can almost hear the spoken word in some of the addresses . . . an excellent index."

DISCUSSIONS IN EDUCATION

Edited by JAMES PHINNEY MUNROE. 342 pp. 8vo. \$3.00 net.

The author had hoped himself to collect these papers in a volume.

The Dial: "A fitting memorial to its author. . . . The breadth of his experience, as well as the natural range of his mind, are here reflected. The subjects dealt with are all live and practical. . . . He never deals with them in a narrow or so-called 'practical' way."

Literature: "The distinguishing traits of these papers are open-mindedness, breadth, and sanity. . . . No capable student of education will overlook General Walker's book; no serious collection of books on education will be without it. The distinguished author's honesty, sagacity, and courage shine on every page."

The Boston Transcript: "Two of his conspicuous merits characterize these papers, the peculiar power he possessed of enlisting and retaining the attention for what are commonly supposed to be dry and difficult subjects, and the capacity he had for controversy, sharp and incisive, but so candid and generous that it left no festering wound."

HENRY HOLT & CO. 29 West 28d St., New York
378 Wabash Ave., Chicago.

ii 1900

A NEW EDITION UP TO DATE

WALLACE'S RUSSIA

By SIR DONALD MACKENZIE WALLACE

With two colored maps, \$5.00 retail

The first edition of Wallace's "Russia" was published in 1877, and was at once accepted as the leading authority in English. The author has brought the book up to date, and the present edition, rewritten throughout and greatly enlarged, may now be accepted, as the first one was, for the one work in our language most needed by those who care to understand Russia.

CONTENTS: Travelling in Russia; In the Northern Forests; Voluntary Exile; The Village Priest; A Medical Consultation; A Peasant Family of the Old Type; The Peasantry of the North; The Mir or Village Community; How the Commune has been preserved and what it is to effect in the Future; Finnish and Tartar Villages; Lord Novgorod the Great; The Towns and the Mercantile Classes; The Pastoral Tribes of the Steppe; The Mongol Domination; The Cossacks; Foreign Colonists on the Steppe: Among the Heretics; The Dissenters; Church and State; The Noblesse; Landed Proprietors of the Old School; Proprietors of the Modern School; Social Classes; The Imperial Administration and the Officials; Moscow and the Slavophiles; St. Petersburg and European Influence; The Crimean War and its Consequences; The Serfs; The Emancipation of the Serfs; The Landed Proprietors since the Emancipation; The Emancipated Peasantry; The Zemstvo and the Local Self-Government; The New Law Courts; Revolutionary Nihilism and the Reaction; Socialist Propaganda; Revolutionary Agitation and Terrorism; Industrial Progress and the Proletariat; The Revolutionary Movement in its Latest Phase; Territorial Expansion and Foreign Policy; The Present Situation.

"A book of extreme value on a remarkably difficult subject has been rendered invaluable—nay, indispensable."—*Nation*.

"Masterly, in the same class as . . . Mr. Bryce's 'American Commonwealth,' and it is in some respects a greater achievement. . . . Impossible to praise . . . too highly."—*London Times*.

Henry Holt and Company

29 W. 23D STREET

(VII, '05)

NEW YORK

